
THE
LITTLE
BOOKS
OF
MODERN KNOWLEDGE

Central BAPTIST
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

presented by

W. L. CHANEY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

4
back

W. L. CHANEY

THE LITTLE BOOKS
OF MODERN KNOWLEDGE

—

PROTESTANTISM

BY THE

VERY REV. W. R. INGE, C.V.O., D.D.

DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S; HON. D.D., OXFORD AND ABERDEEN; HON. D.LITT., DURHAM AND SHEFFIELD; HON. LL.D., EDINBURGH; FELLOW OF THE BRITISH ACADEMY; HON. FELLOW OF KING'S AND JESUS COLLEGES, CAMBRIDGE, AND HERTFORD COLLEGE, OXFORD

GARDEN CITY, NEW YORK
DOUBLEDAY, DORAN & COMPANY, INC.
1928

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Meaning of Protestantism	1
The Gospel and Protestantism	3
Transition to Catholicism	6
Latin Catholicism and Early Protestant Revolts	9
The German Reformation	20
Zwingli	26
Calvin	27
The Anabaptists	34
Socinianism	36
The Reformation in England	37
The Quakers	43
Rationalism	47
Evangelicalism	50
Romanticism	53
Anglo-Catholicism	53
Modernism	56
Non-Episcopalian Protestantism	58
Developments of Protestantism in Germany	60
The Seat of Authority	68
Institutionalism	70
Secularity and Other-Worldliness	72
Protestantism and Science	74
Prose and Poetry	75
Protestantism Still in the Making	76

C

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES
AT
THE COUNTRY LIFE PRESS, GARDEN CITY, N. Y.
FIRST EDITION

284.09
T 45

PROTESTANTISM

MEANING OF PROTESTANTISM

A PROTESTANT should mean one who makes a "protestation," which Samuel Johnson defines as "a solemn declaration of resolution, fact, or opinion." The verb "to protest" had the same meaning in the time of Shakespeare and later. "I have a wife whom I protest I love." "Do me right, or I will protest your cowardice." The negative meaning, of an expression of dissent, is later than the original application of the name to the Reformed Churches, which dates from a Declaration made by the Lutheran princes and some Free Cities in 1529. Their "Protestation" was simply an assertion of the liberty of reforming Diets. It is ignorance which seeks to restrict the word to the attitude of an objector.

But we have to deal with facts, not names, and to treat of Protestantism not as a historical incident, but as a permanent factor in the evolution of religion. It would be at least as shallow to regard Protestantism as a movement which began in the sixteenth century, as to confine the name of Catholic to those who acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope. There have been Protestant movements in all the great religions; there was a parallel, though independent, Reformation in Japan. Christianity itself, as will be shown presently, began as a Protestant movement within the Jewish Church. On the other hand, there is much in the so-called Protestant Churches which is not really Protestant. In this little book an attempt will be made to determine the essential characteristics of Protestantism, to trace its working in the history of the Christian Churches, and to estimate its value as a formative principle in the future.

What is the main function of Protestantism? It is essentially an attempt to check the tendency to corruption and degradation which attacks every institutional religion. The general features of a religion are determined by the state of culture reached by the peoples who hold it. A religion as believed and practised cannot be far in advance of its wor-

29106

shippers. If a nation is progressing, its religion will become more enlightened and more ethical; if it is declining, its religion will lose its connection with conduct and will degenerate into formalism and superstition. It is difficult to say whether organized religion has on the whole done more to promote progress or to retard it. Its function is mainly conservative; it prevents gains from being lost, and abuses from being remedied.

Religion embodied in institutions is like those chemical substances which are never found pure. The inspiration, or revelation, which gave it birth, and to safeguard which it embodied itself in an organized Church, partly congeals and partly evaporates. The religion, now identified with the institution, mixes itself with earlier forms of belief and traditional modes of worship; it finds room for primitive superstitions and hallowed traditions, changing rather the *nomina* than the *numina* of the cults which it supplanted. It is often entangled with the tortuous policy of a hierarchy greedy of power and pelf; it is drawn into secular politics and identified with non-religious interests.

Protestantism is the revolt of genuine religion against this secularization. Almost always we find it advocating ethical purity against ceremonial rules, and individual freedom against ecclesiastical discipline. We find it claiming the right of immediate access to God without the intervention of a professional priesthood; we find it insisting on inward conviction in the place of unquestioning obedience, docile acceptance, and surrender of private judgment. Protestantism usually asserts and emphasizes the absolute worth of the individual, and so rejects the extreme forms of institutional loyalty, and the organic theory according to which some are called to acquire a fund of superogatory merit to make good the deficiencies of others.

Protestantism is always in intention a return to an earlier simplicity and purity. It is doubtless true that revivals are always attempts to restore what never existed; the ideal is invested with authority by being assumed to have been realized at some period in the past. Every religious revolution calls itself a reformation, and declares that its motive is not to destroy but to fulfil. The Reformation of the sixteenth century was not in fact a return to the Christianity of any period of the past, though, as we shall see, it could appeal very effectively to the original Gospel. But it did grasp the essentials of a spiritual faith, and in attempting

to secure them it was ready to throw away a great part of what the masses, especially in the Mediterranean countries, have always understood and still understand by religion.

THE GOSPEL AND PROTESTANTISM

THE prophets were the Protestants of the Hebrew religion. The conflict of prophet and priest is perennial; there is seldom even a truce, except when "the prophets prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means, and the people love to have it so." The Jewish prophets were unable to prevent the victory of the priests, for after the political misfortunes which overwhelmed the Hebrew nation, it had either to organize itself as a Church or perish. But the prophets succeeded in recording their protests against sacrifice and ritual, and against the heavy and growing burden of unethical precepts and prohibitions, which always lead in practice to a neglect of the weightier matters of the law, justice, mercy, and truth. Psalms like the Fiftieth, and the splendid outburst of Micah ("Wherewith shall I come before the Lord, and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt offerings, with calves of a year old? Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath showed thee, O man, what is good, and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God") are entirely in the spirit of the Reformation, and of Protestantism at all times. It is surprising that such passages were suffered by the hierarchy to remain in the Canon.

Jesus Christ deliberately placed Himself in the prophetic succession. His forerunner, John the Baptist, had revived the earlier type of prophecy, long fallen into desuetude, the type of prophecy connected with the name and career of Elijah. Christ Himself lived as a prophet, taught as a prophet, and died as a prophet. He was popularly known as "Jesus, the prophet of Nazareth in Galilee." But whereas the earlier prophets had aimed at moral and social reform, He, with full consciousness of what He was doing, made a revolution. He abolished at a stroke the whole principle of

religious hierarchies. His disciples were to be a band of brothers; there was to be no precedence among them except in service. He spoke "with authority," but it was an authority derived from God only. He knew that there was that in His message which, once uttered, could never be forgotten, because it awakens an echo in the hearts of all true men. "Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away." The witness of the Spirit was and is that He had "the words of eternal life." The door to heavenly wisdom and blessedness is opened to all who knock; the pearl of great price is found by all who diligently seek it. The light of life shines from within; if it is extinguished, "how great is that darkness"! With sovereign confidence, He revises the Law of Moses. "Ye have heard that it was said to them of old time . . . but I say to you" something different. The old garment and the old wineskins must be discarded; they cannot be utilized for the new cloth and the new wine which He brought. The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath. According to a story preserved in an old manuscript of St. Luke, "Seeing a man working on the Sabbath day he said unto him, Man, if thou knowest what thou doest, thou art blessed; but if thou knowest not, thou are accursed and a transgressor of the law." As for ceremonial washings, fastings, and the like, He declared that nothing entering into a man can either defile or cleanse him. From within, out of the heart of man, proceed all things that can exalt or debase the character. "This he said, making all meats clean." These words tear up materialistic sacramentalism by the roots, and repudiate any obligation to keep prescribed fasts and dietary rules. They entirely justify St. Paul's claim of perfect freedom for the Christian in such matters. "He that regardeth the day regardeth it unto the Lord, and he that regardeth not the day, to the Lord he doth not regard it. He that eateth eateth unto the Lord, for he giveth God thanks; and he that eateth not to the Lord he eateth not, and giveth God thanks." Nay, He even said, "Destroy this Temple, and within three days I will raise it up." It was not worth while for the false witnesses to misquote these words; in their genuine form they were blasphemy to the hierarchy. For their plain meaning is that even if the whole institutional structure of the Jewish Church were swept away, the power of the spiritual Gospel could in a very short time create

it afresh, or rather, in place of the visible Temple, build another Temple made without hands, a sanctuary kept holy in the hearts of men as a habitation of God through the Spirit. "Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first the inside of the cup, that the outside may be clean also." From within outwards, from the individual to the society—this was His method, in sharp contrast to the religion of the Pharisees, then and since. Prayer is to be in private, in the bed-chamber; self-discipline is as far as possible to be concealed from others; access to the Father in heaven is direct and easy, for He seeth in secret, and knoweth what we need before we ask Him. This surely is the teaching of an emancipator who is not afraid to be an iconoclast. Only the boldest preachers of a spiritual Gospel have dared to be equally uncompromising. Christ taught a very radical Protestantism.

It was felt at once that here was "a New Covenant." The prophecies of Jeremiah and of Joel were soon remembered. The days should come when men should no more ask others to show them the Lord, "for they shall all know me, from the least to the greatest of them." The days should come when the Spirit of God shall be poured out upon all flesh, when "your sons and your daughters, your servants and your handmaids" shall prophesy. The Spirit is the centre of the new dispensation; the Spirit—that is to say, God regarded as immanent and self-revealing in the souls of men and women, of lay folk, even the immature and the uneducated. This Spirit was the continuation of the Incarnation under another form; it was not only the Spirit of God, but the Spirit of Christ. As Bengel says: *"Conversio fit ad Dominum ut Spiritum."* And the Spirit brings complete emancipation from the dead hand of ecclesiastical tradition. "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

Christ abolished all barriers of race, colour, sex, and church by ignoring them. The exclusiveness of the Jewish Church was utterly abolished. No intermediaries are needed between God and man. There is an end of all material sacrifices; the only acceptable sacrifice under the New Covenant is the consecration of ourselves. The law of love embraces all that need be retained of the old legislation. He founds no new religion, in the ordinary sense of the word; He institutes no creed, no priests, no sacred writings. If He prescribed baptism as a simple ceremony of admission,

the Supper as a commemoration of His death, and perhaps, as the Fourth Evangelist narrates, the sacrament of feet-washing as a symbol of humility and service, these symbolic acts had a very different significance from the sacerdotal magic of a later age.

This being the essential character of the original Gospel—a drastic reformation of Judaism, which was certain to shatter the ecclesiastical structure of the Jewish Church as it had come to be—every Protestant movement may justly claim to draw its inspiration from the New Testament. But the very serious question arises whether, after the changes which the Church underwent within the lifetime of some of the first disciples, it was or ever will be possible to go back to the original Gospel, without shattering the structure of Christian institutionalism as the Gospel itself shattered the structure of contemporary Judaism. For long before the end of the first century the Church had suffered, or rather welcomed, the greatest transformation in the long course of its history. It had ceased to be a Semitic religion, and had become a European religion. It had gained Europe and lost Asia. It had entered the circle of Hellenistic civilization, and placed itself in competition with other cults of Oriental origin, which began to grow wild on European soil wherever the Roman steam-roller had obliterated local traditions and mingled all nations in a hotch-potch like that of a modern American city.

TRANSITION TO CATHOLICISM

It has been said very truly by Troeltsch that the Catholic Church was the last creative achievement of the classical civilization, which may be said to have died in giving birth to it, as the independent Hebrew nation begot the Jewish Church as its posthumous child. We cannot understand Church history unless we realize that the Catholic Church is a product of Hellenistic civilization. The eastward limit of Christianity was the eastern limit of Hellenism; when the latter receded, the former receded too. The great work of the successors of Alexander the Great was to bring East and West together, Greece contributing philosophy, the East religion. From this marriage came the religious and philosophical movements under the Empire, including Christianity as we know it. It was important that the later

Seleucids were obliged to make Antioch on the Orontes their capital. The Hellenisers among the Jews had two centres, Antioch and Alexandria, but there were other seats of Jewish-Greek culture, of which Tarsus in Cilicia was one.

In the epistles of St. Paul we can trace, in an indisputably authentic source, the beginnings of this great transplantation of the Gospel. St. Paul, a Greek-speaking Jew with at least some knowledge of Hellenic thought, was converted to the Christianity of Stephen, not to that of James, the Lord's brother, in whose influence at Jerusalem we can discern the germs of Christian Caliphate in the family of the Founder. But Palestinian Christianity soon shrivelled and died away. According to Justin Martyr, who must have known the facts, Jesus was rejected by the whole Jewish nation, "with a few exceptions." Judaism also rejected the dangerous compromise with Hellenism, and became once more a purely Eastern religion. A complete break with Judaism was necessary if Christianity was to survive; and since ideas must be given through something, the repudiation of Judaism meant an approximation to the Hellenistic forms of religion, with their cult of divinized heroes, their sacramentalism, their asceticism, their ethical treatises and sermons, and their tendency to make religion philosophic and philosophy religious.

St. Paul was the great pioneer of this movement. It was he before all others who presented the Gospel in the form which was to conquer the Roman Empire for Christ. This was his work in history, and it explains why he was on one side the founder of Catholicism, and on the other of Protestantism. In his revolt against Pharisaism, and in his profound understanding of the essential parts of the Gospel of Christ, he was, as he has been always regarded, the hero of Protestantism. The unconcealed dislike for him manifested by those who are most imbued with Catholic ideas is an instinctive acknowledgment that he does not belong to them, but to the opposite camp. On the other hand, though the sacramental element in his teaching has been, in my opinion, very much exaggerated by many Catholic apologists and by some Modernists who can see in Liberal Protestantism only an illegitimate compromise, there are signs that especially in the later years of his life he was alarmed by the lawlessness of undisciplined

mysticism, that he was moved by the idea of the Church as the corporate representative of the illuminating Spirit, and that he found the idea of grace mediated by the Sacraments increasingly attractive. He uses the language of the pagan mysteries, which in the Greek-speaking countries was now the regular language of religious experience, without any reserve. The mystical union between the soul of the Christian and the Spirit of Christ was the core of his personal religion; and through this opening might enter other parts of the religion of the mysteries. As I have said elsewhere, "just as the Jewish Christians took with them the whole framework of apocalyptic Messianism, and set the figure of Jesus within it, so the Greeks took with them the whole scheme of their mysteries, with their sacraments, their purifications and fasts, their idea of a mystical brotherhood, and their doctrine of salvation ('*soteria*' is essentially a mystery word), through membership in a divine society, worshipping Christ as the patronal deity of their mysteries."

St. Paul, however, remained a partially Hellenised Jew, and never relaxed his repugnance at pagan idolatry and depravity as he saw it. Neither he nor the early Church at the time of the persecutions had any desire to put Christianity on a level with the Gentile mystery cults, which with large tolerance made room for each other and were often combined by adepts in the devout life. Nor is there the slightest ground for attributing to St. Paul any crude belief in sacramental magic. The direct influence of the mysteries upon the Catholic Church is often both antedated and exaggerated. The Church and its enemies were agreed in recognizing that there was an impassable gulf between Christianity and paganism. The progressive stiffening of Catholicism was the result of the hostility of the imperial Government, and also of the necessity of combating insidious danger from Gnosticism and other heresies. We have soon to admit the influence of Roman imperialism itself upon the Western Church. The Græco-Oriental religion was being Romanized and partially barbarized as it moved West. In the East the history of Christianity was different. There the tradition of the ancient culture, much weakened and emasculated, lived on long after civilization in the West was submerged under a welter of barbarism. Under the Byzantine Empire, Church and State were set side by side and in close alliance. This feebly living civili-

zation produced no Renaissance; this sluggish Church neither provoked nor stimulated any Reformation. Attempts to deepen religious life in the east of Europe have usually led only to ascetic movements, sometimes of a bizarre and barbarous kind. At last, after the Turkish conquest, the Greek-speaking Christians were outside "Christendom" as recognized by the West.

LATIN CATHOLICISM AND EARLY PROTESTANT REVOLTS

In Western Catholicism the three main ingredients are, first, Roman Imperialism, with its claim to universal sovereignty for the power which dictates to the world from the Seven Hills of the Eternal City. To this claim belong the treatment of all dissentients as rebels, the assumption of a right to absolve subjects from allegiance to their secular Governments, the establishment of an *imperium in imperio* wherever the Roman supremacy in religious matters is acknowledged; the standing army of priests and monks, pledged to military obedience to whatever orders may be issued from headquarters; the denial of any validity to the Orders or Sacraments of other Christian Churches; and, in a word, the whole audacious claim to a monopoly of divine grace, vested in a single corporation. Next to this comes the popular syncretistic religion of the Mediterranean peoples, with its scarcely veiled paganism and polytheism, its local shrines, its miracle-working images, and its mass of childish but picturesque superstitions, cleansed by the Church from their grosser features, but exploited by the hierarchy as a source of gain and a means of influence. Third in importance is the Hellenistic philosophy of religion, which passed almost entirely into Christianity when Neoplatonism began to decay. This philosophy, already scholasticized by Proclus, became in the hands of the Schoolmen a coherent body of doctrine, arid sometimes and unspiritual, but abreast of the secular thought of the time, and as an intellectual system worthy of more respect than modern thinkers are disposed to pay to it. It had, above all, this advantage, that it provided the Catholic mystics with a philosophy of religion derived from the greatest of mystical philosophers, the third-century thinker, Plotinus.

Fundamentally alien to Roman Catholicism are the northern code of honour and chivalry, which, none the less, forced its way into the Mediterranean countries, now completely overrun by invaders of Germanic stock; the homage to free inquiry which began again at the Renaissance, and has developed powerfully in our own day as the inspiring principle of modern science; the secular religion of progress, which flourished from the precursors of the French Revolution to the Great War, and became the source of a materialistic and wholly this-worldly apocalyptism; the monistic pantheism which was favoured by the Romantic movement, and which is the creed of many educated people to-day; and, lastly, the anti-rationalistic philosophy which has many branches in our time, and which is the metaphysical basis of Catholic Modernism. Some, but not all, of these modern tendencies can come to terms far more easily with Protestantism.

A political philosopher may find an interesting parallel between the evolution of the secular Roman Empire and that of its heir, the very substantial "ghost" which Thomas Hobbes saw sitting crowned and sceptred on the ruins of it. Instead of the "progress" towards democracy which the nineteenth century foolishly supposed to be almost a law of nature, the Roman State passed from an aristocratic republic to a camouflaged dictatorship, and thence to a sultanate of the Asiastic type. Similarly in the Church, the senate of bishops gave place to a constitutional monarchy, and this to the undisguised and unlimited Papal absolutism, which was the logical climax of an institution formed so closely on the Roman imperial model. The claim which was formally recorded and sanctioned as a divinely revealed dogma in 1870 was no new thing. Gregory VII. had asserted not only the complete infallibility and absolute sovereignty of the Popes, but their plenitude of sanctity. This last claim was quietly dropped, since the defence of it was too difficult even for papal apologists. But "the plenitude of power, even of issuing a new creed," is claimed for the Pope by Thomas Aquinas. Those who dared to question this absolute and all-embracing authority were formally anathematized. The consent of the Church to the decrees of the Holy Father is unnecessary; "the definitions of the Roman Pontiff are in themselves *irreformabiles*." Pezzani (in his *Codex Sanctæ Ecclesiæ Romanæ*, 1893, quoted by Sabatier in *Les Religions d'Au-*

torité, p. 38), says: "Universal honour and obedience are due to the Roman Pontiff, even if he be a bad man." He is to be deemed to hold all laws within his breast; he is above the canon law. "He may declare, relax, or even abrogate laws for the whole Church." He may even nominate his successor, if it pleases him. Thus the edifice of despotism was gradually built up. At present the Roman Catholic polity is the sole survivor of this type of government, a highly interesting specimen of a species which has everywhere else become extinct.

The Roman Church is a metaphysical entity clothed in flesh and blood. It is the "glorious Church" of St. Paul, externalized and brought down from heaven to earth. In the course of its growth into an autocratic empire it provided itself with a mythological pedigree, like the legends of Romulus and Remus, and with forged title-deeds, such as the Donation of Constantine and the spurious Decretals. True to the traditional character of Rome, it willingly left to other churches the honours of philosophy and mysticism; its function was to rule. Almost instinctively it revived the miraculous claims by which the older priesthoods had established their power. The arts and crafts of sacerdotalism have never been exploited with such pertinacity and ingenuity.

The Greek Church in the fourth century endeavoured to refute heresy by argument, and so built up a Christian philosophy, which in the West became scholasticism. But Rome never encouraged discussion with dissentients; it condemned and silenced them as soon as they opened their mouths. The criterion of orthodoxy was external and legal, making all argument superfluous. The Church of Rome, which, it was claimed, had never paltered with heresy, had received its doctrine from the apostles, the apostles from Christ. *Roma locuta est; causa finita est.* The kingdom of God was practically identified with and merged in the institutional Church. The claim of monopoly was absolute. Already in the third century Cyprian had enunciated the theory that the Church was like Noah's ark, which offered the only possible refuge during the deluge. "No one can have God for his father who has not the Church for his mother."

Authority is the past within us stirring against the future. It has its legitimate function in human life; it curbs rash experiments which may often be deleterious

and sometimes fatal. It preserves the gains of the past from being lost, as without it they may easily be; it prevents the oscillations of the pendulum from being too violent. But it may easily become tyrannical and intolerably oppressive, paralysing the intellect, inhibiting all progress in ideas, and strangling whole civilizations in its merciless grip. This has been the character of tradition in Roman Catholicism. It is invested with supernatural infallibility. Even the Scriptures, which might have imposed some check upon the arbitrary power of the Church by leading men back to the very different atmosphere in which the Gospel drew its first breath, are deprived of their authority. The laity are not encouraged to study them, and the Church claims the sole right of interpreting them. The master of interpretation is also the master of the text, especially when the literal meaning is disparaged in comparison with allegory and edification. A modern Ultramontane has even said, "Without the authority of the Pope, I should not put the Bible above the Koran."

The whole edifice of ecclesiastical tradition rested on fictions. It is not true that the apostles drew up and bequeathed an immutable "symbol" of faith. It is not true that succeeding generations added nothing to and subtracted nothing from the Christianity of the apostolic age. It is not true that the bishops are, by devolution, the successors of the apostles and the inheritors of their supernatural gifts. The lists of early Popes and bishops have no value. In all probability there was, properly speaking, no bishop of Rome before the reign of Hadrian.

No doubt the right of interpretation may be, and sometimes has been, used as a means of relaxing the grip of the dead hand. When Pio Nono said epigrammatically, *"La tradizione sono io,"* he was claiming freedom from the decisions of his predecessors. Complete autocracy cannot bear to be fettered by the past. There is here no gain to freedom, except for the autocrat himself and the Curia of his advisers; but the idea of development has found an entry into a system which in theory had been as unchanging as the laws of the Medes and Persians. It has found an entry, and it has been an explosive force in the Roman Church. Newman was one of the first to see how much elasticity the Church might gain by regarding the presence of the Holy Spirit in the Church as a living and active energy, a continuation of the Incarnation in a growing organism which

is the body of Christ. But to make the Church the creator instead of merely the custodian of tradition is to make dogma fluid again, and to weaken the force of the appeal to antiquity. So Newman, who hated Liberalism, helped to sow the seed of Modernism, that "compendium of all the heresies." The new Papalist theory never intended to admit real development of doctrine; the only motive was to safeguard the plenary inspiration of the existing Pope, from whom no appeal must be made to the past. But the Roman Church is thus involved in contradictions, and has involuntarily called attention to the numerous changes which have actually taken place in its teaching.

The Catholic theory of the episcopate falls to the ground because the first link in the chain, the commission of the bishops by the authority of the apostles, is an obvious myth, which no scholar can any longer defend. In the first century, bishop and presbyter are designations of the same persons. The Council of Trent anathematizes those who deny that the threefold hierarchy was ordained by God. However that may be, it was not ordained by Christ during His early ministry, and it was unknown to the Twelve Apostles. Nor can primitive authority be claimed for a Christian "priesthood." St. Paul, in enumerating the names of offices in the churches of his foundation, does not say, "He gave some priests." The only priesthood known to the New Testament is the "royal priesthood" of the believers generally. The apostles never belonged to the orders of bishops and deacons; their functions were different and superior. St. Peter was probably never "Bishop of Rome" in any sense of the word; he lived and died a "layman," like his Master.

The other great Churches did not accept the pretensions of Rome without protest. Even Tertullian speaks with contempt and indignation of a "peremptory declaration" by the prelate who calls himself, forsooth, *pontifex maximus* and *episcopus episcoporum* (Tert., *De Pud.*, i.); and Cyprian in the middle of the third century says that "none of us has the right to call himself bishop of bishops, or by tyrannical intimidation to bind his colleagues to obey him." But the logic of events favoured the Roman pretensions, till the time came when Boniface VIII. proclaimed that it is necessary to salvation to own that all human beings are subjects of the Supreme Pontiff (Bull *Unam Sanctam*).

It is not necessary to dilate upon the unparalleled scan-

dals which accompanied and followed this usurpation of arbitrary power. The Papacy at the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the sixteenth century was the open sore of Europe. The fall of the Hohenstauffens in the last half of the thirteenth century had left the Papacy in almost undisputed possession. *"Roma caput mundi regit orbis frena rotundi."* The claim to release subjects from their obedience was not a dead letter; treason was more than once encouraged and ordered from Rome. Roderigo Borgia in the Bull *Inter cetera divinæ* made a present of the New World to Ferdinand and Isabella. Moreover, the Pope was the sovereign of all "spiritual persons" in every country of Europe, and of all the vast Church lands, convent estates, parish glebes, and the like. "Spiritual persons" paid taxes to the Pope alone, not to the sovereign of their country. The system of Reservations was extended till it was claimed that the Holy See owned all benefices; the Roman Chancery contained a schedule of prices to be paid for each benefice. It would take too much space to enumerate the various extortions to which the faithful had to submit, including the notorious dispensations and indulgences. "The Roman Curia," says Luther—and the statement can be proved up to the hilt—"is a place where vows are annulled, where a monk obtains leave to quit his Order, a priest to take a wife, a bastard to become legitimate; where there is such a buying and selling, cheating and lying, robbing and stealing, debauchery and villainy, that Antichrist could not reign worse" (Lindsay, *Hist. of the Reformation,* vol. i., p. 13).

These monstrous abuses, of which the half has not been told, not only justified the Reformation; they made it inevitable. But it is well known that there were other contributory causes of the outbreak, not primarily of a religious nature. Such were the consolidation of compact nationalities in England and France, and the growth of the civic idea, which was something much more far-reaching than the superseding of one form of government by another. It was a change in the whole conception of authority, which from being an absolute and Heaven-ordained relation of subservience to a theocratic system, became a mutual agreement between the rulers and the ruled. These political and social changes in the age of the great revolt against Rome belong to the history of the Reformation; they are not strictly part of the history of

Protestantism. But the demand for radical reform in the Church was no new thing in the sixteenth century, and all the characteristic doctrines of Protestantism had been anticipated in the various abortive movements for reform throughout the Middle Ages. It is not difficult to see why these movements failed. The prestige of the Church, which, in the ignorance of Eastern Christianity which prevailed in the West of Europe, was held to be the only Church, was immense. The dual rule of Pope and Emperor, the sun and moon of the intellectual sky, seemed to be as securely established as the firmament of the heavens. It was fortified by historical fictions and priestly forgeries; but in truth it hardly needed these illegitimate sanctions. Disgust and contempt for priests and monks were widespread, and find copious expression throughout the literature of the Middle Ages; but the demand was for reform, not for revolution, still less for secession. We shall see how the Reformers themselves refused to contemplate a Christianity which had broken loose from institutionalism. The Church had been able to harness and control ascetic movements like those of the monks and friars. Mysticism, which is inwardly independent of time and place, of creed and Church, was tolerated and honoured, though not without some suspicion; nor are mystics, as a rule, the stuff out of which rebels are made. There were certainly some revolutionary mystics, and the writings of the greatest religious philosopher of his time, Meister Eckhart, were condemned as heretical, but the mystics of the cloister were generally willing to accept the protection of the Church, and to live in loyalty and obedience to it.

The effect of the formidable revolts of the Waldenses and Albigenses, which were cruelly suppressed, was to call into existence the great mendicant Orders, the Franciscans and Dominicans, just as the Society of Jesus was the Catholic answer to the Reformation of the sixteenth century. Rome met rebellion not only by calling in the secular arm to massacre and burn, but by enrolling a new fighting militia.

The Waldenses are a good example of Protestantism before the Reformation. These simple and pious folk were Biblical Christians. They translated the Scriptures and read them in their own language. They insisted on the priesthood of the laity, and denied the validity of sacraments administered by a wicked priest. Like the

later Reformers, they refused the name of sacraments to all rites except Baptism and Holy Communion, which were "ordained by Christ Himself."

Troeltsch rightly emphasizes the importance of what he calls the sect-type of Christianity. The word is used without any disparagement; the sects have been, in his opinion, often in the true line of the original Gospel, and have been especially important in developing the sociological implications of the Christian idea. The following characteristics of the sect-type are enumerated by Troeltsch. They are of the essence of Protestantism, and it is not surprising that he finds in these "stepchildren of the Reformation," who were disowned and sometimes persecuted by the great Reformed Churches, a more typical expression of Protestant ideas than in the Lutheran and Calvinist bodies or the established Church of England.

The asceticism of the Catholic Church had been a means of heroic virtue, a counsel of perfection for the few. It was not hostile to secular life, and did not interfere much with it, since it was recognized that the majority were not called to the exercise of the higher saintliness. The sect on the other hand did not admit that a double standard of morality could be justified from Scripture, although the words of Christ to the rich young man, "If thou wilt be perfect, go, sell all thou hast and give to the poor," might seem to favour the Catholic theory, that to some at least the choice is offered between what is sufficient and the pursuit of a more exalted ideal. Protestant asceticism was the simple principle of renouncing the world. The sects placed themselves in strong opposition to "the world" as embodied in the then existing social order. In some ways they resembled the societies of monks who had made the great renunciation; but the object of the sectaries in mortifying their bodies was not to subdue the lusts of the flesh, but to establish a band of earnest Christians, united by love and enthusiasm against secularity. The great difference between them and the Catholics was that sectarian asceticism is the duty of all who are called to salvation. The Catholics accepted the existing social order, the imperfections of which belonged to what they called the Law of Nature—not, indeed, the original Law of Nature which might have been obeyed strictly in the time of man's innocency, but the relative Law of Nature adapted to the fallen state of humanity. The sects were

more uncompromising, and went straight back to the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount. This refusal to accept the secular social order as morally defensible led them to advocate radical reforms in the organization of society. They were drawn into politics, since they wished to remodel both Church and State in accordance with the teaching of the New Testament.

They looked back to the Bible and to the primitive Church. These two recognized authorities gave them a place to stand on in their repudiation of all the abuses of Church and State in their own age. For the first time in the history of Christianity, social reform in the modern sense began to be advocated as a part of Christian ethics.

Sectarian mysticism has also some distinctive features. Less inclined than the Catholic mystics to expect and welcome "mystical phenomena" such as fill the pages of Catholic manuals on mysticism, the sectarian mystics relied almost entirely on the inner light, which was sometimes in danger of itself becoming external, since it was sharply distinguished from the uninspired thoughts of the subject. The mystical experience of the sect-type resembles the voice which St. Paul heard bidding him cross over to Europe, and is not altogether unlike the *dæmon* or inner prompting of which Socrates spoke to his friends. Sometimes, however, we read of long and lonely spiritual struggles, such as are described by Fox and Bunyan. A very different development of sectarian mysticism is found in the epidemic revivalism which breaks out from time to time, especially in so-called Celtic populations.

These early Protestants anticipated most of the distinctive post-Reformation tenets. They were anti-clerical. They rejected Purgatory as a state nowhere revealed in Holy Scripture. They held that since war is contrary to the spirit of the Gospel, Christian peoples ought not to engage in it. Social distinctions, which are contrary to the fraternal ideals of Christianity, ought to be abolished in a Christian society. Their piety was individualistic and morally rigourous. Their devotion to liberty and equality was mixed with a revival of apocalyptism, the characteristic religious form of the dreams of "a good time coming" which makes other men Socialists. This last feature has always been common among Protestant sectaries.

In Italy and Southern Europe generally, Humanism and the Renaissance, secular politics and the victory of the

Curia, brought these movements to an end. At last it became plain that the Church in those countries had nothing more to fear from the sects. No victorious Reformation was possible in the South.

In the North, the analogous movements associated with the names of Wyclif and Huss came rather later—in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In England, the so-called Lollard heresy was not a rising of the poorer class, but a national awakening, favoured at first by the kings, and directed against Papal absolutism. Wyclif tried to combine two ideas. He wished to revive the ideal of the ancient poor Church, before it was corrupted by wealth and imperial favour. He also wished to see the Church independent of the secular power. "The Law of Christ," he said, "is the core of the Laws of the Church." By the Church he meant "the number of the predestined." But, above all, he insisted on the freedom and the priesthood of the laity, who must claim the right of access to the throne of grace without priestly intermediaries. As part of this declaration of independence, he assailed high sacramental doctrines, and the growing cult of saints, images, and the like. His social position was very unlike that of the Waldenses, who were poor and simple people. Wyclif was a learned scholar, and enjoyed powerful patronage. It was perhaps in part a historical accident that he did not effect a successful Reformation in England. His friends of the House of Lancaster, when they ascended the throne with a doubtful title, found it prudent to ally themselves with the Church, and dissociated themselves from Lollardism. The attempted rebellion of Wat Tyler brought suspicion on the movement, just as Luther feared that his Reformation would be compromised by the Peasants' Revolt, which in consequence he denounced with reckless vehemence.

Wyclif, however, was no revolutionary. His disciple Huss drew consequences which Wyclif had left alone. He attempted the organization of the sects, and a new order in social relations conceived in a Radical spirit. His martyrdom, instead of stopping the Protestant movement, caused it to assume a more militant temper, which helped to inspire the great agrarian revolts of the later Middle Ages. All the ideas of the Hussites were revived in the seventeenth century by the English Independents and the still more Radical offshoots of Independency.

By the side of this aggressive sectarianism there was another sectarian type—individualistic, indifferent to the world, ascetic, and politically harmless.

The growing centralization of Church organization in the Papacy, and the alliance between the Church and the threatened landed aristocracy, crushed for the time all sectarian reforms. But the changing face of Europe was bringing about a greater revolution. Germany was astir with intellectual curiosity and zest for knowledge. The violent hostility of the monks to the new learning only called attention to the miserable intellectual equipment of those who came forward as the fighting champions of unreformed Christianity. Ridicule proved the most effective weapon against them; the *Epistolæ Obscurorum Virorum* are still read with amusement. The great Erasmus, little as he sympathized with Luther, could not help being on his side against the truculent obscurantism of the Orders.

The connection of the Renaissance with the Reformation is a complicated subject. The rebirth of classical antiquity in Italy, encouraged by the Popes, was no revival of spiritual or moral religion. Professor Krauss, in the *Cambridge Modern History,* says: "The instruction which Pope Julius II. gave to Michelangelo to represent him as Moses can bear but one interpretation—that Julius set himself the mission of leading forth Israel (the Church) from its state of degradation, and showing it (though he could not grant possession) the Promised Land at least from afar, that blessed land which consists in the enjoyment of the highest intellectual benefits, and the training and consecration of all the faculties of man's mind to union with God." The movement soon degenerated into a neo-paganism, in which there was an ominous recrudescence of those crimes and vices which Christianity, though it could not extirpate them, had driven underground and greatly diminished. The most brilliant age of the Renaissance was also the time when the extortions of the Papal treasury were most shameless, its political ambitions most undisguised, and its moral corruptions most scandalous. The northern Reformation was at least as much a reaction against the Renaissance as a development of it. This Erasmus understood; and since he was devoted both to the extension of humane learning and to the moral reformation of Christendom, his ambiguous attitude in the convulsions of his time is easily understood

and, indeed, justified. He desired a Reformation, but not the Reformation which actually occurred.

But though the "candle" of Protestantism was not kindled by Humanism, nor by the new scientific discoveries which the Reformers denounced as trenchantly as their opponents, it was of decisive importance that the century which ushered in the Reformation saw the rise of a new type of cultivated layman, for whom Christianity was only one among several elements in the moral and intellectual character of an educated man. This essentially modern type of layman did not perhaps give much assistance to the first Reformers, though books like More's *Utopia,* with its free criticism of existing institutions, were a powerful solvent of the established order in Church as well as State; but in the modern period, when Protestantism and Humanism are becoming more and more conscious of their affinity and of the community of their interests, the cultivated layman is the arbiter. It may be his function to inaugurate a new Reformation, an Erasmian Reformation, which will place Protestantism on a broader basis than Luther or Calvin could give it.

THE GERMAN REFORMATION

The movement headed by Martin Luther, whose dominant position was due to the fact that he was singularly typical of his time, was primarily religious, though secular forces contributed to its partial success. The idea of making religion the birthright of the common man, instead of the preserve of ecclesiastics, was not alien to the thought of the average pious family in Germany at the time of Luther's birth. All Luther's ideas—justification by faith in the atonement, forgiveness as a free gift, the duty of Bible study—were parts of the religious teaching imparted in thousands of German homes, where little books of instruction in German were much used. Beautiful carols, like *In Dulci Jubilo,* in a mixture of Latin and German, were sung everywhere. Devotion was made more intense by a deep feeling of fear and restlessness which swept over the people, caused chiefly perhaps by devastating epidemics and by reasonable alarm at the Turkish peril. But there was also profound social unrest and class hatred.

The priests were detested; the poor, whose condition was going from bad to worse, were at a loss to account for the mysterious rise in prices which followed the increased output of the mines in Europe. This misery, while it deepened the piety of those who were ready to listen to Luther's preaching, had a more obvious effect in stimulating Catholic superstitions, pilgrimages, traffic in pardons, and Mariolatry, to which was now added the cult of St. Anne, the mother of the Virgin, a purely mythical figure. By the side of the increasing activity of laymen in religious matters we find a new popularity of the mendicant Orders.

There had been numerous translations of the Scriptures into the vernacular in several European countries. Dr. Lindsay quotes from an Austrian inquisitor, as early as the close of the thirteenth century: "The third cause of heresy is that they translate the Old and New Testament into the vulgar tongue, and so they learn and teach. I have heard and seen a country clown who repeated the Book of Job word for word, and several who knew the New Testament perfectly." The Constitutions of Arundel (1408) prohibit anyone from translating "any text" of Holy Scripture into the English tongue, and in the time of the Albigenses no one is to be allowed to possess a copy of the Old or of the New Testament, "except a psalter or breviary or the Hours of the Virgin Mary"; and even the permitted books are not to be translated into the vernacular on any pretext. Nevertheless, "twenty-two editions of the Psalter in German appeared before 1509, and twenty-five of the Gospels and Epistles before 1518" (Lindsay). Many versions of the whole Bible were printed in High German, and three in Low German, during the last decades of the fifteenth and the earlier decades of the sixteenth century. Some of these pre-Reformation Bibles were still in use at the beginning of the eighteenth century. The discovery of printing had thus a decisive effect in preparing the way for the Reformation.

Luther was a rough-tongued Saxon peasant. He was also a very earnest monk. "If ever a monk had got to heaven by monkery," he said, "I should have been he." When he suddenly gave up the study of the law, and put himself under the severe rule of the Augustinians at Erfurt, he did so because he wished to save his soul, and hoped to win salvation by the time-honoured Catholic

discipline of prayer, fasting, and mortification. He was regarded by the brethren as a saint, too morbidly scrupulous, but terribly in earnest. It was Staupitz, the Vicar-General of the Congregation, who taught him that the righteousness of God may become our righteousness through faith in Jesus Christ. The seed fell on ground prepared for it; he experienced a sudden illumination, which shaped itself in the words, "The just shall live by faith," the text which became the corner-stone of his whole theology. About two years later he left Erfurt for the small convent at Wittenberg, which was ever after to be associated with his name.

It would be out of place in this little book to tell again the well-known story of Luther's appearance as champion of the German Reformation—his indignation over the sale of Indulgences by Tetzel, and the Ninety-five Theses which he nailed to the door of the Church of All Saints at Wittenberg. It is not disputed that Catholic theologians taught that only the temporal punishments of sin, not the guilt of it, can be redeemed by paying for indulgences. But the temporal punishments included the pains of Purgatory, as described by Dante and others; and the plain people who bought the indulgences drew no refined distinction between punishment and guilt; they believed that they were purchasing very tangible benefits from those who had them to sell. Luther denounced the whole system as a blasphemous swindle. The Three Treatises, "On the Liberty of a Christian Man," "To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation," and "On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church" (1520), made the breach with Rome irreparable; in them Luther struck at all the pretensions of the Papacy. The real "spiritual estate" is not the clergy, but the whole body of Christians; the clergy are only men set apart to do a particular kind of work, which they may do well or ill. The laity are also priests. He denies indignantly that the Pope alone can interpret Scripture; if that were true, "let us burn the Scriptures, and content ourselves with the unlearned gentlemen at Rome." The Pope replied with a Bull, in which he complains that foxes are wasting the vineyard at St. Peter, and that "the errors of the Greeks and of the Bohemians are being revived." Luther and his friends are given two months to recant, failing which they are to be treated as heretics. This Bull was publicly burnt by the intrepid reformer, together with the books of the

Papal Decretals, to the huge delight of the populace; for Luther's teaching had set the torch to a powder magazine in Germany; he had suddenly become the national hero.

What were the distinctive parts of Luther's teachings? Was he, without qualification, a Protestant? That he largely determined the character of Protestantism in Germany and Scandinavia cannot be doubted.

His interest was primarily in the practical religious and moral life; he was not a great theologian, and his knowledge of Church history was very defective. There was no such contrast as he imagined between the early and the medieval Church. The early Church was not so pure, nor the Church of his own day such a mass of corruption, as he supposed. His honest peasant soul had been scandalized by what he saw of the Papal Court, but he knew nothing of the abuses which had already begun in the fourth century. It is curious that this veneration for the early Church has affected all Protestant countries, not least our own; this is mainly a legacy from Luther. A more fortunate doctrine was based on his belief that he was already "saved," rather than still on his probation. This notion he never found in St. Paul, nor in any reputable Christian theologian. It was, perhaps, the result of his thought of God as an angry Potentate; to be *forgiven* by such a Power was all that was necessary; not transformation of character, but a verdict of acquittal, was the seal of salvation. "Grace alone is life eternal, and wrath alone is death eternal." Grace is not, as for the Catholics, the deiform nature imparted; it is the merit of Christ imputed. This doctrine might easily lead to antinomianism, and the danger is always present in Lutheranism. The peril was only increased by his identification of faith with *trust*—a very serious impoverishment of the meaning of the word. It is true that Luther recognizes two kinds of faith, and insists that faith must necessarily, and almost automatically, express itself in good works; but it is not true that faith as *fiducia* always has this result. We can probably trace in this defective conception of faith a rebound from the anxious reliance on penances and good works which had made him miserable while he was a young monk.

Much more satisfactory is his consistent teaching that there is no distinction between sacred and profane things, the difference being in the way in which we handle them.

The service of our fellow-men, undertaken simply because it is right, and without any notion of acquiring merit for ourselves, is the typical mode of life which is pleasing to God. A maidservant doing her housework properly is performing a duty more acceptable in the sight of God than a monk macerating himself in the cloister. It is plain that Lutheranism inculcates a different temper from Catholic piety—confidence instead of fear, liberty instead of submission, gratitude instead of the hope of reward. This teaching is capable of forming a fine type of character. Luther begins his treatise on "Christian Liberty" by saying: "A Christian man is the most free lord of all, and subject to none: he is also the most dutiful servant of all, and subject to everyone."

His doctrine of the Church is not quite consistent; he wavered as to the essentials of a true Church. But he insists that all the faithful "are worthy to appear before God, to pray for others, to teach each other the things that are of God." The priest, even at the Holy Communion, is but the mouthpiece of the congregation, who are present "in their priestly dignity." But we look in vain for any clearly intelligible teaching about the Church. Is the Church the Communion of Saints, the aggregate of Christ-like men and women, and therefore fully known only to God, or is it a visible institution, outside which there is no salvation? How much authority is left to the Church when the final court of appeal is no longer the hierarchy, but the Bible interpreted by the plain man? "The Holy Ghost," he said, "is the simplest writer and speaker in heaven or earth; therefore His words can have no more than the simplest sense." And yet within Holy Scripture there is "the Gospel," by which the various books even of the New Testament are to be judged, and ranged in different classes according as they approach to or recede from it. "St. Paul's Epistles are more a Gospel than Matthew, Mark, and Luke. John's Gospel, St. Paul's Epistles, especially that to the Romans, and the First Epistle of St. Peter, are the true kernel and marrow of all books." "The Epistle of St. James is a mere Epistle of straw; it has nothing evangelical about it." Thus the authority of Scripture is subject to a purely subjective valuation; the most precious books are those in which Luther finds his own theology! As for the Church, Baptism

makes a man a priest. But Luther will not draw the logical conclusion about sacraments; he quarrelled with Zwingli on the question of the Real Presence. It is on this subject that he is least Protestant and furthest from the state of mind which seems to follow naturally from his main conceptions. He insists that the sacraments are the fixed channels through which divine grace flows. This seems not to have been his view always; it was after his experience of the Radical sectaries that his doctrine stiffened and became more external. He taught that the water, when sanctified by the word, becomes something other than itself; but how does this differ from the Catholic theory of an *opus operatum?* How essentially un-Protestant his theory became is shown by his answer to the question whether, if a mouse swallowed a crumb of the consecrated bread, the mouse would have partaken of the Body of Christ. Luther decides in the affirmative.

The criterion of a true Church is that the Word of God is preached in it. The Church is the mass of people who believe in Christ, and outside the Church there is no salvation. And yet he will not allow, with Wyclif and Huss, that the Church is the number of the predestinated, for this is a mere totality of segregated units. The kingdom of God is not the visible Catholic Church—and identification attributed not quite correctly to Augustine—but rather the reign of Christ in the hearts of men. It is impossible to reconcile these views; they have introduced much confusion into the theology of Protestantism.

Luther, then, was a reformer who was not a philosopher or theologian. He was reactionary in several ways, and the Humanists, who at first had hopes of him, soon discovered that there could be very little sympathy between them. By exalting faith and disparaging works, and by using *Glaube,* with its intellectualist associations, he attached more importance to correct belief than even the Catholics had done; the way was open to a new era of arid scholasticism. He wished to extend no tolerance to Anabaptists and other sectaries, and had in principle no objection to persecution. His attitude during the Peasants' Revolt remains a blot upon his career, though it must be admitted that his position was extraordinarily difficult. The whole future of his life's work seemed to depend on the successful vindication of their author-

ity by the princes. Lastly, in spite of the strongly ethical character of his teaching, there was a grossness in his treatment of sexual questions which has reacted unfavourably on the morals of the German people.

ZWINGLI

The Reformation in Switzerland was almost independent of Luther, and its leader was very unlike the leader of the German movement. Huldreich Zwingli was already preaching against indulgences at Einsiedeln at the time when Luther made his great protest at Wittenberg. He was born in 1484, less than two months after Luther, and his activities were in the German-speaking cantons of Switzerland. Calvin, the other great Swiss reformer, was twenty-five years younger, and was French; it will be necessary to deal with his career quite separately. But Zwingli also deserves separate treatment; he was a pioneer, and but for his early death might have stamped his influence strongly on the Reformation.

He was brought up for the priesthood, a member of a clerical family; he never went through the harrowing spiritual experiences of Luther. He was a scholar and Humanist, and also a zealous parish priest at Glarus. He had much sympathy with Erasmus, but differed from the Humanists of that circle, partly in his fervent patriotism, and partly in his affection for the common people. He read Luther's early writings, and was probably moved by them more than he was willing, after their quarrel, to admit. In most ways the teaching of the two men, especially in relation to the great Church against which both revolted for much the same reasons, was very similar, whether we call the resemblance parallelism or reciprocal influence. But Zwingli is the father of Liberal Protestantism, as Luther certainly is not. He read Greek and Hebrew, not only for the sake of the Old and New Testaments. He knew Pindar, Plato, Aristotle, Thucydides, and Plutarch, and was misguided enough to learn Valerius Maximus by heart. He shocked Luther by hoping that he might meet the sages of antiquity in heaven.

Characteristic sayings of Zwingli, which no one could mistake for Luther's, are the following: "Piety is a fact and an experience, not a doctrine or a science." "It is the

part of a Christian man not to talk magnificently of doctrines, but always, with God, to do great and hard things." "The knowledge of God in His own nature precedes the knowledge of Christ." The Church is the number of the elect, who include heathens as well as Christians, unbelievers as well as believers, infants as well as adults. The invisible Church is thus quite different from membership in any corporation.

Zwingli was more consistent and clear-headed than Luther in his doctrine of the sacraments. He taught that the Lord's Supper was primarily a commemoration of the death of Christ, and that the means whereby the merits of that death were conveyed to the believer were faith, and not the reception of the material elements. There is a Real Presence of Christ in the sacrament, but only after a spiritual manner. The words of institution, "This is my body," are not to be taken in a literal or materialistic sense. These views indicate a real divergence from those of Luther, but not more than might have been got over with a little goodwill. The goodwill, however, was absent on Luther's side. He chalked on the table, *"Hoc est corpus meum,"* and would make no concessions for the sake of concord. Thus the fissiparous tendencies of the Reformation manifested themselves very early, and worked havoc with all attempts to present a common front against the dangerous and far better disciplined foe.

Zwingli, like Calvin after him, took an active part in administration and politics. He fell in battle, fighting bravely for Zürich, at Cappel, in 1531, when he was forty-seven years old.

CALVIN

Jean Cauvin was born at Noyon in Picardy in 1509, the son of a distinguished lawyer. No province in France had produced so many disciples of Wyclif and Huss as Picardy, and the adherents of these "heresies" were far from extinct at the beginning of the sixteenth century. He was trained for the Church, but his father, who had been excommunicated by the ecclesiastical authorities at Noyon, transferred him to the law school at Orleans.

When his father died in 1531, Cauvin determined to forsake the law for literature, and made friends with some leading French Humanists. His learned and excellent edition of Seneca *On Clemency* was probably meant as a protest against the persecution of the Protestants, for Cauvin, or Calvin, had already been converted. In 1533 he was driven from Paris, where he was studying and lecturing, and took refuge in Switzerland. The famous *Christianæ Religionis Institutio*, by far the ablest statement of the Protestant position that had yet appeared, was first published at Basel in 1536, and reissued in a much enlarged form in 1539. In 1536 he took up his residence at Geneva, where from 1541 to his death in 1564 he may be said to have reigned.

Geneva, like every other medieval town, had a variety of sumptuary laws which interfered with private life at every turn. They were usually a dead letter, but from time to time a moral fit seized the City Fathers, and maidservants were summoned for wearing silk aprons, or rich burghers for giving too good dinners. Calvin's regulations were quite in accordance with medieval practice in these matters. But his avowed object was to restore the discipline and practice of the primitive Church. The Holy Communion was to be administered much more frequently, and evil livers were to be forbidden to communicate. The censures of the Church were to be enforced by the civil power. But there was great opposition to excommunication; and if we wish to see how Calvin's disciplinary ideas were put into practice, we must look, not so much at Geneva, as at the French Huguenots and John Knox in Scotland.

But Calvin made Geneva the citadel of the Reformation and a city of refuge for persecuted Protestants from other lands. The native population of 13,000 was swelled by some 6,000 refugees. He was a great organizer, and, after his expulsion and recall, was able to set his stamp on the government of the town.

His great aim was to make the invisible sovereignty of God, revealed to man in Holy Scripture, as tangible and visible as the medieval Church had been. It was a great and necessary work to prove that Protestantism was not a synonym for the surrender of discipline and the relaxation of moral obligation.

Calvin was more intellectual and more friendly to

Humanism than Luther, but less so than Zwingli, for Calvin, though a theologian, was not a philosopher, and his practical mind was impatient of speculation. Calvinism has proved far more active and aggressive than the rival school, which has always tended, on one side, towards quietism and acquiescence. Calvin taught that we are fellow-workers with a transcendent God, not in the mystical sense, for Calvin was no mystic, but as soldiers in an army on the side of God against the powers of evil. Energy rather than deep feeling was the proof of justification; the consciousness of being accepted by God was a spur to action. Majesty, holiness, and grace, rather than love and mercy, are the attributes under which the Calvinist thinks of the Deity.

The doctrine of predestination was really a common belief of the Reformers, and belonged naturally to the theory of justification by faith only. At first Calvin closely followed the teaching of Luther on this subject; but his opinions hardened, and assumed the form afterwards characteristic of the Calvinist Churches, after his study of Bucer's *Commentary on the Romans*, which appeared in 1536. The doctrine thus embodied in the *Institutes* was Bucer's, but it was Calvin who gave it a place in systematized Protestant theology. It has been pointed out by more than one critic of Calvinism that Calvin's doctrine of God is really pantheistic, since he admits only one effective will in the universe. This would be so if Calvin had been a philosopher, as Zwingli was. But Calvin always regarded God as a distinctly personal Being; the arbitrary will which he attributed to Him was more like the conception which the Hebrews formed of Jehovah than the impersonal energy of a pantheistic deity. Nevertheless, the resemblance of Calvinism to Stoicism is very close, and the two religions (for Stoicism became a religion) fostered the same hard and resolute type of character.

Calvin was not a modern theologian, any more than Luther. It is even possible to represent him as a reactionary. The doctrine of total depravity belongs to the Middle Ages, and is as alien to the thought of the Renaissance as to the modern ideas. How unqualified is his teaching on this subject may be gathered from a typical passage of the *Institutes*. "Let it stand as an indubitable truth, which no inquiries can shake, that the mind of man is

so entirely alienated from the righteousness of God, that he cannot conceive, desire, or design anything but what is wicked, distorted, foul, impure, and iniquitous; that his heart is so thoroughly environed by sin that it can breathe out nothing but corruption and rottenness." "To know God," he says again, "is to be struck with horror and amazement, for then and only then does one realize his own character." His doctrine of the Church is nearer to Catholicism than that of Luther. He repeats the favourite Catholic dictum that he who has not the Church for his mother cannot have God for his Father; and, unfortunately, his readiness to employ the secular arm to punish ecclesiastical indiscipline was as great as that of a Catholic inquisitor. Religious toleration owes nothing to Calvin.

The martydom of Servetus has always, and rightly, been considered a blot on the reputation of the Genevese Reformer. No doubt he wished to prove to the world at large that Geneva had no sympathy with Unitarian heresy; but the fact remains that seven years before the arrest and execution of the unfortunate Spaniard, Calvin wrote to his colleague Farel, "If he comes, I shall never allow him to go away alive, if my influence has any weight"; nor can it be argued that Geneva had any jurisdiction over a foreigner who was merely passing through the city. The "expiatory monument" erected in 1903 at Geneva admits the truth. "Fils respectueux et reconnaissants de Calvin, notre grand réformateur, mais condamnant une erreur qui fut celle de son siècle et fermement attachés à la liberté de conscience selon les vrais principes de la Réformation et de l'Évangile, nous avons élevé ce monument expiatoire." Unhappily, this cruel act was far from an isolated instance of the persecuting spirit. "Within sixty years the registers of Geneva show that a hundred and fifty poor wretches were burnt for witchcraft; that the application of torture was an incident of almost all criminal trials; that thirty-one persons were burnt at one time for the fantastic offence of spreading the plague" (Beard). If these atrocities were the work rather of the civic authorities than of Calvin, there can be no mistake about the temper which inspired the letter which Calvin wrote in 1548 to the Protector Somerset: "From what I understand, my Lord, you have two kinds of rebels who have risen up against

the King and the state of the realm. The one are fantastic people, who under colour of the Gospel would cast all into confusion; the other, obstinate adherents of the superstitions of the Roman Antichrist. Both alike well deserve to be suppressed by the sword which is committed to you, seeing that they attack not the king only, but God, who has seated him upon the throne, and has entrusted to you the protection as well of his person as of his majesty" (Beard).

The Judaizing tendency of Calvinism cannot be denied. Biblical infallibilism was more trenchant and earlier formulated than the infallibilism of the Roman Church. The letter of Scripture was regarded with superstitious reverence. The idea of a covenant between God and His people was revived. The Church was a new Israel, with a new law. Lutheranism needed the Bible only to prove the work of Christ, and rested mainly on some of St. Paul's Epistles. Calvinism made the whole book an universal oracle, with some terrible consequences, such as the belief in witchcraft.

The consciousness of election to salvation, instead of producing a paralysing fatalism, inspired a vigorous and confident energy, rising to fanaticism. The creature is of no value except as a means; the elect is a chosen vessel in God's hands; his life is given him for a definite purpose. A strong and steady self-control, extending over the whole of life, is practised. Perfection is not an ideal for the few; it is an end which all the elect are bound to pursue. Calvinistic asceticism is something quite distinctive in Christian history. Self-denial has no merit in itself; it is merely a means to promote the victory of Christ's kingdom. In practice it means the reduction of all sensuous enjoyment to what is necessary or useful. In the typical Calvinist we find a vigorous political interest, but not for the sake of the State; a steady diligence in labour, but not for the sake of riches; a careful, often intrusive, social organization, but not for the sake of increasing human happiness; a zeal for productivity, without any great interest in the objects of production. This peculiar discipline has given, not only to Calvinistic morality but to the societies influenced by Calvinism, a distinctive character quite unlike that of the Lutheran countries. Calvin laid great stress on a man's calling. All work is taken up into the religious sphere; there is no distinction between sacred

and profane. For the first time in the history of Christianity, the dignity and value of work as work is fully insisted on. It is God's ordinance that men should work; without work there can be no holiness. Consequently, idleness is one of the worst of sins.

It is often brought against Calvinism that it is a brutal and prosaic creed, hostile to beauty and art. This is really not true. Calvin himself, as we have seen, was a Humanist and a fine scholar, and the Puritan was often a student, a connoisseur of art, an accomplished musician. A good example of the Puritan home is that of the Milton family. John Milton's father was a musician, who often regaled his family with madrigals of his own composing. The boy John sat up till midnight studying Greek, Latin, French, and Italian. Colonel Hutchinson, the regicide, was a lover of the arts, a collector, and a musician. The Puritans dressed plainly, but well and carefully; they were very cleanly in their persons, more so than their opponents. Their dislike of ornament and symbolism in divine worship was due to their fear that doctrines which they wished to exclude might so be reintroduced.

The effect of Calvinism on social and economic life was so important that something must be said about it. The distinction commonly drawn in the Middle Ages, between the absolute and the relative Law of Nature is now much weakened. Private property now becomes without qualification a part of the divine law. The division of the Decalogue which the Church of England has adopted is Calvin's, and is not without significance. The First Table includes the command to worship God without images, magic, and ritual, and the Fourth Commandment is still binding. In politics, Calvinism favours a Conservative democracy; there is not the same emphasis on patient submission that we find in Luther. The idea of equality, so dear to the Latin races, has no place in Calvinism.

Was Calvinism in favour of Christian Socialism? Yes and No. It accepted the system of capitalism as it then existed, but severly condemned its abuses. Monopolies, usurious interest, shoddy manufactures, fraud of every kind, came under the lash of the Church. All luxurious and ostentatious expenditure was blamed. Industry and thrift, in the service of the people of the Lord, were commended. The system tended to drastic reform of social

abuses, but not at all to revolution. John Knox was much more revolutionary in his ideas than Calvin, but he lived in Scotland, where kingly and feudal tyranny was still a danger. He proclaimed the rights of the people against "tyrants," and advocated popular government. Yet even he was at bottom Conservative. The Levellers, the real revolutionary faction in England, were not Calvinists.

Calvin was convinced that the Christian spirit is compatible with trade and industrialism even of the newer type. He preferred capitalism to feudalism, because the former, when regulated as he desired, assures a reward to hard work and thrift. Thus, while Lutheranism was linked with the old agrarian and patriarchal structure of society, Calvin reaches out a hand to modern industrialism. The atmosphere of Geneva—though Geneva was not a great business centre—was very different from that in which Luther moved.

So we can understand how Calvinism helped to create that curious product, the modern business man, who works like a slave, and sometimes rules like a slave-driver, in accumulating money which his tastes and his principles forbid him to enjoy, and about the value of which to himself or others he asks no questions. It has been said that the successful money-maker of to-day is either a child of the Ghetto or a grandchild of John Calvin. No system was ever so effectual in promoting that kind of progress which is measured by statistics. If you can convince a nation that steady industry in profitable enterprise is eminently pleasing to God, but that almost all ways of spending money unproductively are wrong, that nation is likely to become very rich.

We can study the working of this system best in America and Scotland; but it is breaking up even in those countries. The asceticism which was an essential part of it has almost disappeared; even if the money-spinner himself still sometimes leads an austere life, his wife squanders enough for two. And the leadership in what Aristotle called the chrematistic life has passed from the individual manufacturer, directing his own business, to the banker and financier. The religious basis of capitalism and productive industry has been undermined. The question, What is the use of these activities? is being asked with more and more insistence. Bentham's hopeless attempt to affix quantitative values to the higher interests

of life went far to break up Calvinism as a social gospel. The Manchester School was not Calvinistic.

But whatever criticisms we may think it right to make upon the work of Calvin—and there is no doubt that his teaching about reprobation has driven many persons to despair and suicide—we must not forget the inestimable services which he rendered in preventing the Reformation from being abortive. In Beard's words: "It was the form of faith in the strength of which the Dutch Republic was sustained and the American Republic was founded; to propagate which Tyndale gave to the English people the Bible in their own tongue, and with his life, which formed the royal intellect of Cromwell, and inspired the majestic verse of Milton."

THE ANABAPTISTS

The orthodox Biblical Reformation which established itself in Northern Europe was far from exhausting the possibilities of Protestantism, which in the words of Harnack was "a rediscovery of religion as faith, as a relation between person and person, higher therefore than all reason, and living not upon commands and hopes, but on the power of God, and apprehending in Jesus Christ the Lord of heaven and earth as Father." I do not altogether agree with Harnack's view of the Christian religion, a view which is anti-mystical, anti-Hellenic, and Ritschlian, but we have seen that Luther and Calvin were both, in different ways, medieval and even reactionary. In some ways the sects, "the stepchildren of the Reformation," may claim to have been in the true line of development. Of these sects more must be said when we come to the English Reformation. It would be impossible to find room for all the Continental manifestations of the sect-type in a little book like this. Two only will be chosen for brief treatment—the Anabaptists and the Socinians, both of them, in the opinion of nearly all modern critics, by-products of an age of ferment, destined to have but a short career. The former represented the desire, quickened by deep dissatisfaction with the social order of the day, to see the kingdom of God set up at once on earth; the latter represented the critical and rationalistic spirit, which was necessarily discouraged while the Reformation

as a whole was fighting for its existence. Both, in a crude and unsatisfactory way, sought to defend aspects of the truth which the Reformed Churches would after a time be compelled to admit as legitimate parts of organized religion.

The Anabaptists were the Radical party among the Reformers, who blamed Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, and Knox for stopping halfway in the work of reformation, while they themselves were denounced in nearly all the official creeds and articles of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. In some ways they resembled the Waldenses and Spiritual Franciscans, in that they wished to act without the aid of the State or of any Church authority; but they were strong Protestants. They spread rapidly in almost all Protestant countries, and caused great alarm by their subversive social theories. Their career was short, for they were stamped out by ruthless persecution, which their want of cohesion made them powerless to resist, in spite of the self-sacrificing fervour of many among their adherents.

In religion they asserted vehemently the freedom of the will and moral responsibility, against Luther and still more against Calvin. The individual had the right to interpret Scripture for himself. The true Church was composed of the saints only. Infant baptism was rejected. Church discipline was exercised democratically. Baptism, performed on adults, was a declaration of faith; the Lord's Supper a memorial meal; neither had any sacramental efficacy. Many of them were Millenarians of a fantastic type.

In politics they regarded the State as a necessary evil, and discouraged the "saints" from holding any office under the Government. They condemned capital punishment, the taking of oaths, and the bearing of arms. They were, in fact, extreme pacifists, at a time when Europe was exhausting herself by internecine wars.

They advocated a voluntary, and in few instances even an enforced, community of goods. They condemned the payment of interest on capital, and compulsory taxes for the maintenance of churches and ministers. They were in favour of complete religious toleration.

It is plain that these views tended to divide and weaken the Reformation, and that in the hands of fanatics like those who gained possession of Münster in 1534 they

might lead to revolutionary outbreaks; but nothing can justify the atrocious cruelties practised on men and women who were generally both sincere and inoffensive, and whose opinions were on the whole in advance of their time. The Christian Socialism of our day may recognize in Anabaptism its spiritual parent.

SOCINIANISM

HARNACK regards Socinianism as one of the three final stages in the evolution of dogma, by the side of Protestantism and the Catholicism of the Counter-Reformation. This is perhaps to exaggerate its importance, for Socinianism is a form of Unitarianism, and Unitarianism is a creed which does not seem likely to have a great future. The two Sozzini, Lelio and Fausto, were Italians, driven from Italy, where no liberty of conscience was allowed. Fausto (1539–1604) was a great traveller, and founded Unitarian schools in various countries, especially in Poland, where his doctrines became very popular.

According to the Socinians, the New Testament, interpreted by right reason, is the seat of authority. God and man are both endowed with a perfectly free will. God is a single, absolute, arbitrary Person. The Holy Spirit is only a divine energy. In Christology, Fausto Sozzini was nearer to orthodoxy than is usually supposed. He accepted the virgin birth and physical resurrection, the sinlessness of Christ, and His exaltation to the right hand of God. The idea of an atoning sacrifice he rejected.

The Socinians were as medieval as Luther and Calvin, though in a different way. Their whole theology was based on Duns Scotus, from whom they borrowed their doctrine of the arbitrary character of God's rule. They owed something to the Renaissance, but very little to the Reformation. They had a very inadequate conception of sin, and in their attitude towards the Church were ultra-individualistic. The Socinian doctrine of the Sacraments, as set forth in the Racovian Catechism (1605), their chief declaration of belief, resembles that of the Anabaptists. Baptism is only a pledge of faith and obedience, the Lord's Supper only a commemoration of the death of Christ.

The influence of Socinianism was almost entirely distintegrating; but it probably had some influence upon the

Arminian theology, which arose in opposition to the Calvinist teaching of predestination and determinism.

THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND

It would manifestly be impossible to give even a summary account of this important and familiar chapter in our history. But since much prejudice has been imported into it by partisans on both sides, a few remarks may be profitably devoted to removing common misapprehensions.

It is often said that the Reformation in England was political, not religious. The same political philosophers who would have us believe that the German Reformation was caused by the wish of Martin Luther to marry a nun, try to persuade us that England became Protestant because Henry VIII. was tired of his wife, and fell in love with Anne Boleyn. The Tudors, we are told, were autocrats, and their subjects believed, or pretended to believe, what their sovereigns ordered them to believe. The fact is that Henry VIII. had no means whatever of compelling his subjects to obey him. We all know what the apparatus of autocracy is—a strong standing army, an organized bureaucracy, a secret police, a host of spies. Henry, as Dr. R. H. Murray has pointed out, had only one castle in London, defended by a hundred Yeomen of the Guard. He had no secret police, and no organized bureaucracy. He had no standing army, except the Yeomen of the Guard and a few gentlemen pensioners. He not only allowed his people to keep arms, but urged them to have them ready for use. He could not dictate to Parliament, which possessed and used the power of withholding his supplies. In breaking loose from the Roman obedience, and proclaiming himself Supreme Head of the Church of England, the King was acting in accordance with the wishes of his subjects, and he could not have done it if the people had been against him. Tunstall of Durham declared without fear of contradiction that "if the King should go about to renew the abolished authority of the Bishop of Rome, he should find much more difficulty to bring it about in his parliament, and to induce his people to agree thereto, than anything that he ever proposed in his par-

liament since his first reign." The Reformation in England, says Professor A. F. Pollard, evoked less active resistance than any other great religious change, and was accompanied by less persecution.

It will, of course, be urged on the other side that the crucial dates in the English Reformation are not the dates of the promulgation of creeds or articles of religion, but the years at which a demise of the Crown took place. There was a sharp and sudden change at the accession of Edward VI., a still more violent reversal of policy when Mary succeeded him, and another *volte face* when the persecuting Queen was succeeded by Elizabeth. What these facts really prove is that the English people did not think that they had to choose between the old Church and a new Church. The changes would not have been possible had there been the same violent breach between the old and the new that occurred on the Continent. The ultra-Protestant notion that the Church of England began at the Reformation is as wide of the mark as the Tractarian contention that at that period the Catholic Church in England only washed its face. The whole subsequent history of Anglicanism is unintelligible if we do not recognize that the course of the Reformation in England was quite peculiar and unlike what happened elsewhere.

The power of the Pope at the opening of the sixteenth century was not so great as Protestant histories have made out. The days of Hildebrand and Innocent III. were over. In the sixteenth century kings and emperors did not go to Canossa. As Aubrey Moore says in his *History of the Reformation,* the Catholic monarch sacked Rome and imprisoned the Holy Father, the Most Christian King made an alliance with the Turk, and the Defender of the Faith divorced his wife without Papal consent. We need not doubt the genuineness of Henry's scruples about the legality of his marriage with Catherine. The deaths of his children seemed to him a judgment on his sins, which possibly, from another point of view, they were. Rome had quite lately granted royal divorces for reasons of State, and Clement VII. himself proposed that Henry should take a second wife, without taking the trouble to divorce the first. The Papal refusal to grant the divorce was due purely to political considerations.

As for the continuity of the Church through all the

changes, it is proved impressively by the registers at Lambeth, and by the presentations to livings. Bishop Stubbs said that after perusing these lists one might doubt whether any ecclesiastical change had accompanied the Reformation. Kitchin was Bishop of Llandaff without interruption from 1545 to 1563, and there were many Vicars of Bray who adapted themselves to the prevailing wind of doctrine without much scandal. Bernard Gilpin was ordained under Henry VIII., and remained undisturbed, if not unthreatened, under Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth. Only 200 priests were deprived in 1559. The rank and file of the clergy on the eve of the Reformation were so ignorant that their theological opinions were of no account whatever. At the visitation held by Hooper in the Diocese of Gloucester in 1551 it was found that out of 111 clergymen, 71 were unable to repeat the Ten Commandments, 10 could not repeat the Lord's Prayer, and 27 could not tell who was its author. Not more than three or four out of the 111 had ever preached or could preach.

The Reformation in England was not only more conservative than on the Continent; it was attended with comparatively little cruelty. The burnings under Mary were enough to make the name of Papist stink in the nostrils of Englishmen for centuries; but they cannot be compared with the horrors of the Inquisition in Spain, France, and Holland. The executions of Catholics under Elizabeth were executions for treason; the culprits were justly condemned for plotting the deposition or assassination of the Queen. This comparative mildness may be partly due to the dislike of cruel persecution which belongs to the English character, but it was partly due to the fact that the English Reformation was mainly the work of the new middle class which sprang up under the Tudors, a class independent and high-spirited, but in no way fanatical. The emergence of this new class from the decaying feudal institutions was an important factor in the Reformation everywhere, but especially in England.

On Henry's death it became clear that his subjects wished to Protestantize the Church further than he had allowed. The changes introduced in the First Prayer-Book of Edward (1549) had, as Cranmer asserted, all been contemplated by Henry. But they did not satisfy the people, who were now allowed far more freedom of speech than

under the last reign, and were impelled to a more drastic breach with Catholic tradition by a swarm of foreign *émigrés,* such as Peter Martyr, John à Lasco, a Polish noble, and Martin Bucer. Most of these seem to have been Zwinglians; but though their influence was undoubtedly considerable, the Anglican Church never became Zwinglian or Lutheran or Calvinist. It would, on the whole, be truer to say that the English Reformation looked back to Wyclif and resumed the work which he had begun. Dogmatic controversies were of very subordinate importance, but the desire for moral reform and for the removal of abuses was strong and genuine. For the rest, there was a spirit of sturdy independence, which distrusted foreign influences, whether they came from the Reforming camp or from the other. The great Protector Somerset dreamed of an united Great Britain, having the sea for a wall, mutual love for a defence, and no need in peace to be ashamed or in war to be afraid of any worldly power. The break in ecclesiastical policy came with the fall of Somerset and the expulsion of the Catholics from the Council. John Knox himself was offered the Bishopric of Rochester, which he declined. The most important changes in the Second Prayer-Book of Edward (1552) were in connection with the Communion Office. The question between Mass and Communion was felt to be vital, as it always is when the two parties come to grips. It is not a small matter whether we say "altar" or "table," "priest" or "minister." The words of administration were altered in a way which would have satisfied Zwingli. The Ten Commandments were introduced most incongruously into the Communion service, a curious relic of the new legalism associated with the Reformation on the Continent. The Forty-two Articles, on which the Thirty-nine Articles now in force were based, were issued at the same time, with the untrue statement that they had been approved by the bishops and clergy in their convocations. But the death of the sickly child who occupied the throne put an abrupt end to the advance of Protestantism, and exposed England for a short time to the fanaticism of an embittered woman, egged on by Cardinal Pole and Bishop Gardiner. (Bonner seems not to have been quite the ferocious executioner that Foxe describes; he made several attempts to spare the lives of Protestants.) But the burnings went on till the deaths of Mary and Pole on the same

day; the name of Bloody Mary was well deserved, and will always stick to Mary Tudor.

The Elizabethan Settlement, which belongs to the first years of the great Queen's reign, bears, in Protestant eyes, all the marks of an arrested development. It dissatisfied the Marian exiles, who returned to England more Calvinistic than they had left it. It did not satisfy the most earnest convictions of the people, who became steadily more Puritanical as the reign advanced. But Elizabeth and Parker saw with great sagacity that the wave of Puritanism would soon ebb, and that the Church of England must not be remodelled on Puritan lines. Parker's successors, Grindal and Whitgift, were in sympathy with Puritanism; the former was sequestrated from his see by the Queen, who wished to put down the Prophesyings, which were the chief nursery of Puritan opinions.

Elizabeth naturally deposed the Marian persecutors, but the parochial clergy were hardly touched. Only about two hundred were deprived. The Anglicans had no thought of unchurching the Continental Protestants, and the latter were willing to forgive such concessions to what they deemed error, as the order or permission to use the surplice. But the Puritans were far from satisfied. John Knox had reformed the Church of Scotland according to his own ideas, and his friends were bent on establishing the Presbyterian model in England. Parker, with the Queen behind him, wished to preserve continuity with the past, and was determined that the Church of England should keep its national and traditional character.

A crucial question now was episcopacy. In Scotland a parity of ministers had been established, and the ideal of the Puritans was to set up an international council which should control all the Reformed Churches. But in England there was a strong body of Independents, who wished each parish to be autonomous; these refused to work with the Presbyterians. Neither they nor the Presbyterians were separatists, until they despaired of capturing the National Church for their own system. Anglicanism found a powerful champion in Hooker; he defended episcopacy, not on high Catholic grounds, but as the lawful constitution of the Church, "a sacred regiment." But in the latter part of Elizabeth's reign the Puritans became more violent and abusive, and the country was flooded with the scurrilous "Marprelate" pasquinades. The bishops succeeded

in suppressing the disorders, mainly by the help of the High Commission, a court of rather doubtful legality. Nevertheless, the Church was gaining in prestige. The apologetic tone which had been common was heard no more; English Churchmen felt that, in contrast with the violence of the Continent, they had found in moderation and comprehensiveness a more excellent way. Even the Roman Catholics remembered that they were Englishmen, and gradually ceased to plot against the Government. Most of the Puritan clergy were now content to form an evangelical group within the National Church.

The Puritans seem to have had no suspicion that James I. hated the system which in Scotland he had been forced to accept. But such was the fact. The Puritans presented him with a monster petition, and he conceded the Hampton Court Conference, from which they hoped for much and gained nothing. He afterwards sent representatives to the Synod of Dort, in 1619; but this was almost his only concession to the Puritans. He made a serious mistake in legislating for the Church by means of Canons, which constitutionally were as authoritative as Acts of Parliament; but Parliament was in no mood to see important matters decided without its own concurrence. Nor was he wise to ordain three bishops in Scotland who used no service except that of Knox. The compromise seemed to work well at first, but it soon broke down.

Meanwhile, English divines had discovered the Eastern Church, and with it the possibility of being Catholic without being Roman. A new school of Anglo-Catholics sprang up, and evolved a new doctrine of episcopacy, which tended to separate the Church of England from the non-episcopal churches on the Continent. At the same time, the Anglican Church became compromised by its support of the divine right of kings, a new theory in the form which King James gave it, and a doctrine both absurd and distasteful to most Englishmen. It seemed as if the Church had for once mistaken the trend of public opinion; but though Laud and Charles were defeated and put to death, it was soon apparent that the nation as a whole was both monarchist and Anglican. Laud himself showed both courage and wisdom in refusing to bow the knee to Calvinism, and he cannot be justly accused of Romanizing. He claimed the name of Protestant both for his King and for himself.

The Presbyterians seemed at first to have gained the victory in England; the Westminster Confession, which they drew up, is still nominally the rule of the Church of Scotland. The army, however, was not Presbyterian, but Independent, and it was the Independents who now undertook the task of settling the affairs of the Church. The Prayer-Book was banned, and the Anglican clergy ejected, except in those parishes—a large number—where the endowment was too small to tempt the cupidity of supporters of the Government. At the Restoration there was another considerable ejection; the number is usually stated at 2,000. But the tide was flowing in favour of toleration; in Germany the ruinous Thirty Years' War had ended in a compromise. There was a brief reaction under James II., whose incredible folly soon cost him his throne and put the Laudian loyalists in an impossible position. Toleration came in victoriously with Dutch William.

A hopeful attempt at comprehension, backed by Tillotson, Stillingfleet, and Burnet, was wrecked by the bigotry of the High Chuch clergy. The Church settled down into the comfortable prosperity of the eighteenth century, with the loss of Archbishop Sancroft and about 400 non-juring clergymen. But the claims of the Stuart "Pretender" distracted and divided the clergy, and Convocation was silenced in 1717 for more than a hundred years.

THE QUAKERS

Among the sects which were left outside the National Church, none is so significant for the future of Protestantism as the Society of Friends. They are a small body, but outside of their membership there is a large and increasing number of persons whose religion is of the Quaker type, though they are, for the most part, content to remain in the denominations in which they were born and bred. The Quakers themselves are not anxious to make converts. "So long as our principles continue to gain ground," says Caroline Stephen, "we need not, I think, be anxious about outward and definite membership, and we may even rejoice in the lessening of our isolation. Our fundamental principle of obedience to the Light of Christ in the heart is certainly not to be regarded as the distinguishing mark of a sect. The very growth of that obedience must, I believe, lead to the effacing of outlines and boundaries

made by human hands." It is worth while to quote these words, because they illustrate what is, perhaps, the most essential difference between real Protestantism and Catholicism. We have seen that some of the Reformed Churches were exclusive, fanatical, and even persecuting; but in this they were no true Protestants. Esprit de corps, elevated into a fierce warfare on behalf of an organized corporation, is the very essence of Catholicism, and the secret of its formidable strength. This spirit is most conspicuously alien to the temper of Christ Himself, and we cannot suppose that He wished His disciples, in any circumstances whatever, to exhibit it; but intense, bitter, unscrupulous institutionalism has inspired the policy of the great ecclesiastical bodies from almost the beginning of Church history till now. The Quakers are almost alone in being indifferent to the winning of proselytes, and in caring only for the triumph of their principles. Before the end of this little book I shall argue that this is the true temper of Protestantism, which must be content to act as a leaven in human society, transforming it from within, but aiming at no political or statistical triumphs.

The Quaker type was not new in the sixteenth century. The persecuting sects of the Middle Ages, to whom reference has already been made, and the mystics of the same period, were precursors of the Society of Friends. In George Fox the mystical type of Christianity found an original genius, one of the great names in the history of religion.

He was a visionary and a travelling apostle, like St. Paul, and like St. Paul he suffered constant persecution. Over four thousand Quakers were thrown into prison at the Restoration; in North America four members of the sect were martyred on Boston Common. In spite of, or because of, these injustices, at the passing of the Toleration Act it was estimated that the Friends were as numerous as all the other Nonconformist sects put together. But the wind of mystical inspiration bloweth where it listeth, and the eighteenth century, with all its solid merits, did not encourage this type of religion, until the ecstatic revival stirred up by the Methodists gave the religion of emotion what we may almost call an epidemic form. The Quakers were imbued with the quietism which was also a feature in the Catholicism of the Counter-Reforma-

tion. Quietism is obviously not a fighting faith; and the Quakers were too austere in rejecting everything that might attract persons whose interests were not purely religious. When we read such Quaker books as William Penn's *No Cross, no Crown,* we cannot help feeling that the easy yoke and light burden of Christ have been made cruelly heavy. There is no attempt to understand that ritual and cultus are for many believers the natural language of piety; the bare severity of the mystic's lonely climb to the beatific vision cannot, without loss, be reflected in the jejune accessories of public worship. Even the harmless ceremonies of courtesy were condemned by the Quakers as not being rigorously truthful, and in this way unnecessary prejudice was created against men who seemed to their neighbours merely boorish and contumacious.

Here again we have an undoubted feature of Protestantism, carried to an extreme. The Quakers say, with much truth, that if the outward forms of a superstitious belief are retained, the superstition itself will not be long in reasserting itself. Anglicanism wished to abolish the Mass, and to turn it into a Communion; but it retained some symbolic ritual which was at least patient of a Catholic interpretation. The result, as we have seen, is that all the discarded beliefs have again found their way into the Anglican Church. A complete purgation, the Quakers thought, is the only safeguard. This uncompromising policy forgets that the personal religion of the Catholic or Anglo-Catholic is often of a deeply evangelical type, not essentially different from that of the extreme Protestant. Faith takes different forms at different times. The fetish-worship of the English Bible, which is now quite unintelligible to most of us, has given way to the fetish-worship of the consecrated elements. Before condemning these aberrations root and branch, we should reflect that both may be the scaffolding of a simple and genuinely Christian faith. One of the chief problems of Protestantism is how to make use of these symbolic buttresses of faith without sacrifice of liberty and spirituality. The greatest mistake hitherto made by the Protestant Churches has been to lean far too heavily on one of them, and that the least satisfactory—Bibliolatry—and even to suppose, with Chillingworth, that the Bible

is the religion of Protestants. The life has gone out of this idol, and in consequence the whole cause of Protestantism seems, for the time, to be in danger.

The Quakers, under the guidance of Fox, escaped the snare of Bibliolatry, but in the eighteenth century, when the real mystical foundation of their faith was obscured, they were in danger of being merged in the general body of Evangelicalism. They accepted, under the influence of Barclay, the Calvinistic doctrine of man's total depravity, and this obliged them to make the Inner Light itself external, since their theory forbade them to find anything divine in the human mind itself. Thus the foundations were laid for a new religion of authority, with fewer safeguards against self-deception and absurdity than the greater Churches provided. That they, on the whole, escaped these dangers is a strong testimony to the sanity and good sense which have always marked the members of this Society. But the combination of belief in total depravity with the Inner Light led many of them into a docetic doctrine of the Person of the Redeemer, and they were accused of denying the historical Christ. They could have avoided these errors if they had assimilated the teaching of the Cambridge Platonists; but there were prejudices on both sides which kept them from understanding each other.

This is not the place to describe the splendid work of the Society in many branches of social reform, especially in agitating for the abolition of slavery and in exposing the cruelties in the prisons. This humanitarian zeal is one of the legitimate fruits of Protestantism. Catholicism has seldom been active in reforming social abuses, since for it the advancement of civilization has been a mere by-work, when not a matter of indifference. But Protestantism, especially of the sectarian type, has regarded the promotion of the kingdom of God upon earth as part of the will of God and of the duty of man. The Quakers worked with this object in a different manner from Calvin, since they were on principle opposed to coercion. But they were convinced that the law of love covers all our relations with our fellow-men, and that our neighbour is he to whom we can do some good. Their charity differs from that of Catholicism in that the acquisition of merit for the doer has no place in it, and it is far more methodical and business-like. It was one of their teach-

ings that waste and luxury always injure somebody, so that plain living is not so much a valuable self-discipline as a social duty. As John Woolman said: "The money which the wealthy receive from the poor, who do more than a proper share of business in raising it, is frequently paid to the other poor people for doing business which is foreign to the true use of things." It is plain that this economic theory is quite different from the Communism attributed to the Lollards and Anabaptists.

In our own day the Quakers, though they have scarcely increased in numbers, are beginning to exercise a wide influence. Their characteristic form of worship, the silent prayer-meeting, is arousing the attention of other Christian bodies. Their uncompromising condemnation of war is now approved by many who thought otherwise before the terrible experience of 1914 and the following years. Their philanthropy, always judiciously as well as generously exercised, has won a new respect for Christianity in the lands where they have laboured to heal the wounds left by the war. And lastly, while they have returned to the mysticism of their founder and his first disciples, they have strengthened its basis by a study of religious psychology, and by sympathetic knowledge of the literature of mysticism. The Quakers are now, what they were not before, a well-educated and highly cultivated sect. We may see in some of them that reconciliation of Protestantism with Humanism which has been long overdue. For these reasons, no one who wishes to estimate the possibilities and prospects of Protestantism in the future can afford to neglect this most interesting little Society, which in many ways seems to realize better than any other what we may think to have been the intentions of Jesus Christ while He was on earth.

RATIONALISM

Those who couple Rationalism with belief, or at any rate with a cold, critical temper, should be reminded of the essentially devout rationalism of the Cambridge Platonists, which arose as a protest against the materialism of Hobbes. The little group, of whom Whichcote, John Smith, Henry More, and Cudworth were the most conspicuous, followed the Neoplatonists in exalting the rea-

son, while at the same time believing in a mystical illumination transcending the discourse reason which we use in judging of earthly things. We owe to them a fine Protestant philosophy, which has made it possible to say that Christian mysticism really came into its own first under Protestantism. The Cambridge men were in advance of their age, which was in no mood to accept their large and charitable tolerance, but their books are a treasure of the greatest value for Protestant theologians, and at the present day are warmly admired. It is not often that we find such courageous confidence in the capacity of the human mind to discover the truth in divine things, combined with such deep and beautiful spirituality. Unfortunately, they remained isolated; it is not possible to trace much influence exercised by them on the rationalizing theologians of the eighteenth century, though Whichcote's *Aphorisms* are found in many old libraries. Even William Law, nonjuor and mystic, perhaps the most robust intellect among the divines of that age, owed very little to men who, as we can now see, were in all essentials kindred spirits with himself.

Tillotson, Archbishop of Canterbury, was a good example of unmystical rationalism. He was a child of his age when he taught that the object of revelation is simply to "establish the duties" laid down by "natural religion." The special duties enjoined by revealed religion have the object of promoting virtue; Christ is our example. Faith is a persuasion of the mind concerning the truth of any proposition—a very poor conception of the virtue which sounder theologians have recognized to be the resolution to stand or fall by the noblest hypothesis, the beginning of the spiritual life, an experiment which ends as an experience. Prophecy and miracle, he argues disastrously, are the chief proofs of Christianity. "Some doctrines are so absurd that a miracle is not a sufficient proof of them; but if a doctrine be such as is noways unworthy of God, nor contrary to those notions which we have of Him, miracles are the highest testimony that can be given to it." Rationalism buttressed not by spirituality or religious experience, but by supernaturalism—such is the unhappy line of defence chosen by this typical divine of the Age of Reason. Locke takes much the same line; the function of revelation is to furnish credentials.

The Deistic controversy was mainly concerned with

the sanctions of morality, which the Deists considered to be sufficiently secured by "the nature of things." On both sides, we feel, there has been a sharp fall of temperature since the Cambridge Platonists. The Deists were right in denying the evidential value of miracles; Tillotson's citadel was finally stormed by David Hume in 1748. Paley, at the end of the century, made a futile attempt to resuscitate the old argument, though he adds that the miracles themselves need to be supported by the excellence of the revelation which they guarantee. The authoritative position given for a whole century by the University of Cambridge to Paley's *Evidences* is one of the strangest examples of religious Conservatism. But the exaggerated homage paid by the whole Church of England to Bishop Butler's *Analogy* is hardly less remarkable. The book was no doubt intended less as an argument against Deism than, as the author says, "to show the obligations of men; not to justify His providence, but to show what belongs to us to do"; but it has been valued as a triumphant vindication of revealed religion, and this it certainly is not. Butler only proves that whatever moral objections we may feel against the scheme of revealed religion are equally valid against natural religion—an argument which, if cogent, would lead most readers to reject both alike. The presumption against miracles, he says, is not enough to render them incredible; the *onus probandi* is laid upon those who would disbelieve the tradition. As a defence of revealed Christianity the book is very weak; and we may conjecture that both it and Paley's *Evidences* retained their position so long because they are very well adapted for examination purposes.

The Deistic controversy ended in a victory for neither the orthodox nor the Deists, but the sceptics, of whom Hume was the ablest. His contemporary Voltaire, in logical France, wished to abolish organized Christianity altogether. But Voltaire knew only the Church in France, which in many aspects was really "infamous." He had a generous hatred of bigotry and cruelty, and was no enemy to the Gospel of Christ as he understood it. But neither he nor the poisonous sentimentalist, Rousseau, who advocated a purely emotional religion, could give faith any solid basis; and the atheism of the revolutionary period was rather encouraged than checked by their influence.

In Germany the writings of the English Deists and sceptics had a wide vogue, but German thought penetrated deeper, and evolved profound systems of metaphysics. These systems, which belong distinctively to the Protestant countries, will be very briefly characterized on a later page, but to give a satisfactory account of them here in this little book would be obviously impossible. Their tendency on the whole has been in the direction of a devout pantheism, combined with evangelical ethics.

EVANGELICALISM

While the dominant type of Christianity was by intention rational and moralistic, it was natural that schemes for the reunion of the Reformed Churches should be conceived. There was not at this time the prejudice against non-episcopal Protestant Churches which was fostered by the Oxford Movement. All through the eighteenth century the Societies for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge (S.P.C.K.) and for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (S.P.G.) supported Lutheran missions in India. Archbishop Wake made overtures to the German Churches which were nearly successful. But such proposals were forgotten in the excitement caused by a new revival of personal and emotional religion, very unlike the temper of the Deists and their orthodox opponents, one of whom is commemorated on his tombstone as "truly pious without enthusiasm."

John Wesley resembled George Fox in that he had revolted against the Calvinism of his family, though in Wesley's case his parents sympathized with his Libertarian views. But he was equally opposed to the churchmanship of the Laudians, and came to hold the Presbyterian doctrine of the equal status of ministers, so that he claimed the right to ordain, an act of open mutiny against Church order. It is often said that a little statesmanship on the part of the Church hierarchy might have prevented a schism which to modern minds seems as unnecessary as it was disastrous. Macaulay contrasts the astuteness of the Roman Church in dealing with an independent and dangerous movement, with the impolitic stiffness of the Georgian Anglicans. But though the Laudians of the Church sympathized with the Arminian views

of Wesley about predestination, they disliked his "enthusiasm," and the other party disapproved of his theology. Besides this, Wesley's whole proceedings tended towards schism, in spite of his professed loyalty to the Church of England. The rigidity of the Anglican parochial system would have been a fatal obstacle to the success of his methods. In fact, however, it was Whitefield the Calvinist, and not Wesley the Arminian, who had a strong influence upon the Church of England. Whitefield broke with Wesley in 1740; and for a whole century, till the beginning of the Oxford Movement, Calvinism was strong in the Church.

The old High Church party, compromised by the alliance with Jacobitism, was a waning influence. Bull, Beveridge, Ken, and Nelson had no successors of the same calibre. Anglo-Catholicism was becoming narrower even in Ken's time. It is significant that in his library were found no writings of the Reformers, but much Roman Catholic literature. His will, in which he protests that he dies "in the holy Catholic and Apostolic faith professed by the whole Church before the disunion of East and West, more particularly in the communion of the Church of England, as it stands distinguished from all Papal and Puritan innovations," shows a retrogression from the dying confession of Laud, and already breathes that curious antiquarianism and staticism which were a mark of Anglican apologetics in the last century. At the time of the Evangelical movement, it seemed natural to couple "high" with "dry." Nevertheless, we must not underestimate the influence of the "Hackney Phalanx" who gathered round Joshua Watson and his friends, as precursors of the Oxford Movement. The temporary depression of the High Church party has sometimes been exaggerated, but it undoubtedly helped the Evangelical movement.

The weak points of the Evangelicals were the modified Calvinism which they advocated, even encouraging the poor to go to Independent Chapels where predestination was preached (we must remember that it was very difficult to create new parishes at that time, even where they were most wanted) and their crude Bibliolatry. On the other side, they greatly raised the standard of clerical duty, and inspired the Church with a new zeal and energy. Under their influence, manners and morals became less

gross. As time went on, their Calvinism was modified or even dropped; it was hard to reconcile predestination with the ardour for foreign missions which was a marked feature of Evangelicalism. But Bibiolatry remained, to be a grievous stumbling-block in the future.

With the Napoleonic War began the strange isolation of England from Continental thought, which alone made the Oxford Movement possible. The Government, hoping that religion might help to stem the current of revolutionary ideas, spent large sums on church-building. But there has never been a time when the prestige of the Church was so low among Liberals. It was said in 1823, "The Church and clergy were never worse spoken of, and never less deserved it" (Overton, *The English Church* p. 10). The *Black Book* (1820) calls the National Church "that foul and unformed mass of rapacity, intolerance, absurdity, and wickedness," and Joseph Hume, a prominent member of Parliament, said in the House, in the course of a tirade of gross insults against the clergy, "I had hoped that these foolish ordinations would terminate." The bishops especially were associated in the popular mind with repression and reaction; the palace of the Bishop of Bristol was burnt in the riots over the Reform Bill, and other bishops were mobbed. This was, however, the prelude to very useful reforms made by Parliament, of which the Ecclesiastical Commission was the most important. The redistribution of revenues then carried out has been of the greatest benefit to the Church. It is difficult for us to realize that one of the causes of the Oxford Movement was dislike of these reforms, of social agitation, and of the very moderate Liberalism in theology in which Tories detected the atheism of Voltaire and the anarchism of Tom Paine. In the next generation it was the Broad Churchmen, such as Charles Kingsley and Maurice, who showed sympathy with the sufferings of the labouring class. Before the days of Chartism, the generous hopefulness of men like Wordsworth, Southey, and Coleridge had been crushed by the transformation of the French Revolution into an aggressive military empire. The young turned to new ideals, to admiration of the past and to ardent patriotism. The Romantic Movement, which was to give a powerful impetus to Neo-Catholicism, had begun. The evolution of Wordsworth's opinions from republicanism and very un-

ecclesiastical religion to Toryism and veneration for Archbishop Laud, is typical. But Wordsworth on another side, the side which matters, represents the transition from transcendence to immanence, from authority to experience, which made him one of the chief religious teachers of a generation which he hardly lived to see.

ROMANTICISM

Revivals are shallow things, and generally consist in attempting to resuscitate what never existed. There was too much of Wardour Street in the medievalism of the early part of the nineteenth century. But the desire for poetry instead of prose, beauty instead of ugliness, imagination instead of flat rationalism, was quite genuine, and the provocation had been great. Coleridge and Carlyle did good service in introducing the British public to the great German idealists, and a robust British philosophy on these lines brought a new spirit into English thought. Coleridge may be said to have revived the theology of the Cambridge Platonists and William Law, and this meant that English theology was to become more Greek and less Latin. The Incarnation instead of the Atonement now became the central doctrine of Christianity. Thus was initiated a line of thought really in accordance with the genius of the nation, which in spite of the common sense, empiricism, and practicality which it had become the fashion to attribute to our countrymen, has always been strongly idealistic, and disposed to welcome the religious philosophy which comes down through St. Paul, St. John and the Greek Fathers from the tradition of the School of Plato. This religious philosophy belongs mainly to the second half of the century, and its influence spread from Oxford after the University had recovered itself from the ecclesiastical fever of the forties.

ANGLO-CATHOLICISM

A reaction in favour of authority against the disintegrating forces of change must necessarily, in the sphere of religion, take the form of a Catholic revival. It was

so in France, where Chateaubriand and De Maistre urged the necessity of placing civilization again under the guardianship of the Church. But in France, after the excesses of the Terror, the reaction was naturally more pronounced; in England it was desired only to create what Canon Storr has called a romance of the Church, in order that loyalty and affection might gather round it. The alliance with Romanticism was precarious. Romanticism dotes on ruins, and hates real restoration. Romanticism idealized the Middle Ages; the Anglo-Catholics, while they remained loyal Anglicans, had no wish to do this, and followed Bishop Ken in appealing to the first six centuries, before the seamless robe of Christ had been rent by schism. It was even more important that Romanticism was essentially a movement towards individual independence, whereas the Tractarians exalted without measure the idea of authority. But the appeal to antiquity was the dream of a few students; a real revival of Catholicism must be medieval in spirit, and the only model which was at hand to copy was the existing usage of the Church of Rome. The movement began by turning its back on the present, which was dominated by the tendencies which its champions wished to destroy; but as it won recognition and set its hopes higher, it increasingly discerned its affinity with the unreformed Church, and would gladly have blotted out the centuries in which the Church of England was indubitably Protestant.

In the Oxford Movement proper, before the secession of Newman, the emphasis was laid on the Apostolical Succession. This fantastic and unhistorical theory, which is not held in the same form by any other Church in Christendom, was intended to unchurch all non-episcopal bodies, and to range the Church of England definitely on the Catholic side. The fact that the Church of Rome absolutely rejected the claim of the Anglican Church to be Catholic did not greatly trouble men like Pusey and Keble, since at this time there was very little intercourse with the Continent, and in England the Latin Church appeared no more than a small dissenting sect. Nevertheless, the entire isolation in Christendom of a Church which claims to be Catholic is a serious matter, and was certain to cause uneasiness in proportion as the principles of Catholicism were better understood. As time went on,

the Apostolical Succession was less emphasized, though the principle which it was meant to establish was still stubbornly asserted. The crucial question once more became the Mass. A materialistic cult of the consecrated elements has sprung up, and the unprimitive practice of reserving the bread and wine for adoration in the churches, which the Thirty-Nine Articles had intended to prohibit absolutely, has not only crept in but tends to concentrate upon itself the devotion of the congregation. It is an interesting example of how the inner logic of a system brings all who accept it into conformity with the normal type.

Principal Fairbairn sums up the policy of the early Tractarians as follows: "To save the Church, two things were necessary—to invest it with divine authority and with all the rights flowing from it against the apostate state on the one hand, and the rebellious reason on the other." "My battle," Newman said, "was with Liberalism" (Richardson, *Conflict of Ideals in the Church,* p. 167). The Oxford leaders denied that they were innovators; but their choice of authorities was arbitrary and unhistorical. Instead of the appeal to Scripture, which the Articles and other declarations of the Anglican Church put first, they went back, in the first place, to the early Fathers, and, in the second, to the English divines of the seventeenth century. They neglected the Liberal or Platonic tradition in the Church, and had no sympathy with the new forces which were stirring in their own time. They idealized a remote period of Church history mainly as a pretext for condemning new developments. By a very strange misreading of early Christianity, they assumed that the sanction for ecclesiastical institutions as they existed at the time which they chose as their norm was to be found in the Gospel itself. This static theory led nowhere but to reaction and stagnation; and the movement gained in vigour when another was substituted for it—that the Church is a continuation of the Incarnation, the organ through which the Holy Spirit still acts upon the world. This was a philosophical idea, not unwelcome to some English Hegelians; but as held by the Tractarians it involved the vast assumptions that the Holy Spirit speaks only through the mouth of one corporation, that His meaning is to be interpreted only through the hierarchy, and that the development of doc-

trine is only a mechanical unpacking of what was present implicitly from the first. This is a false notion of development. There was a special difficulty in applying this doctrine to the Church of England. For it has no organ which can make pronouncements binding on the intellect and conscience of individuals. The only infallible oracle, according to the Anglo-Catholic theory, is a Council which can never meet. The plenary inspiration of the Holy Ghost has gone into abeyance like an old English peerage when there are two or more daughters and no son. It is much as if no Act of Parliament were valid until it had received the sanction of the American Congress.

MODERNISM

In the last generation the Anglo-Catholics have made considerable use of the freedom which their theory gives them in handling Holy Scripture. They have been able to appeal to the educated section of the younger generation on the ground that they are not tied to the Old Testament cosmology and miracles, and that they are more ready than the Evangelicals to come to terms with modern science. This is true against the old-fashioned believers in verbal inspiration; but the freedom of the Anglo-Catholic is that of an animal secured by a short tether. It has been found that those in the party who appear to be most Liberal in concessions to the new knowledge pull themselves up sharply when anything is called in question which is part of the traditional Catholic Creed. They are nervously afraid of compromising themselves by accepting any views which the Church of Rome might pronounce heretical. A miracle which is mentioned in the Creed is on a different footing from one which is attested only by the Bible. Anglo-Catholic Liberalism has one arm strapped to its side, and can free itself only by accepting disintegrating philosophy of Loisy and his school, of which something must now be said.

It would be misleading to speak of a philosophy of Tractarianism, for the movement did not rest upon any metaphysical system. The philosophy which is attracting much attention is that of Continental Modernism—a sort of sceptical pragmatism, which claims, with Heiler and others, that faith is, and ought to be, essentially "irra-

tional." It is partly true that dogma and ritual are the imaginative expression of the inarticulate and subconscious elements in our personality; but Modernism goes much further, and maintains that the same proposition may be true for faith and false as fact. This theory makes the Modernists boast that they are immune to historical and scientific criticism, while it calls rather inconvenient attention to what is the real strength and attractiveness of Catholicism—that it is an admirable system of mind-cure, using the methods of an art rather than of a science, and actually producing those effects upon the character which it promises to achieve. Why, it is asked, should we trouble ourselves about intellectual difficulties when the question is about practice? The Church offers a system of training of unrivalled efficacy; to those who trust themselves to it, it "delivers the goods." Some of the new philosophies encourage the average man to argue in this way, and there will always be many who are very ready to accept such an invitation.

This is the philosophy of Modernism, using the word in its proper sense, of a movement within the Catholic Church. It has not yet made much way among Anglican thinkers, but it commends itself to the national tendency to judge by results. In particular, it may be used to justify devotions before the reserved sacrament and other at present illegal practices. Worshippers will be heard to say that these particular forms give them a spiritual satisfaction which they cannot obtain in any other way, and that this is a sufficient reason for legalizing them.

Catholic Modernism has been decisively rejected by the authorities of the Roman Church, and with good reason. Catholicism is rationalist up to a point; it has always maintained that the existence of God may be demonstrated by human reason. Some Modernists also offend by sitting very loosely to the historical Christ, accepting the most subversive results of criticism about His life, assimilating Him to other Messiahs or Mahdis like Theudas, minimizing the importance of His ethical teaching, and denying that He founded the Church or instituted the Sacraments. They have a dynamic notion of development, very different from Newman's and apply it in a very embarrassing fashion to the chameleon changes of Church history. They claim to have made the Church invulnerable by science or criticism; they have,

in fact, exposed the *arcana imperii* of Catholicism, and have attempted to substitute for the time-honoured theology of Thomas Aquinas an anti-intellectual and anti-Hellenic theory which agrees very badly with the foundations of Christian philosophy. Such Modernism appeals to men who have ceased to be Christians but desire to remain Catholics. In its present form it can hardly have much of a future.

NON-EPISCOPALIAN PROTESTANTISM

Outside the Church of England, Protestantism has had a vigorous life in the two Scottish Presbyterian Churches and in the Nonconformist sects. The general level of preaching has probably been higher in Scotland than in England, since the Church has there drawn from the more intellectual members of the poorer classes, whereas in Victorian England it was too often the least capable among a large family of young gentlemen who was "destined for the Church." A Scottish congregation is also attracted by theological controversy, and is, perhaps, more able to follow a consecutive argument. The discipline of the Kirk Elders has sometimes been inquisitorial, and the influence of Calvin stronger and more permanent than in England. Scotland has produced several notable thinkers and preachers, such as Alexander Geddes, McLeod Campbell, the mystic Erskine of Linlathen, Robertson Smith, and John Caird. The rather bigoted antipathy between the Established Church and the Free Church has now broken down, and there is very little to prevent reunion. Episcopalianism has been almost as weak in Scotland as Presbyterianism in England, and the Episcopal Church there has tended to be Catholic in tone, whereas in Ireland the counter-irritant of Romanism has kept the Anglican Church severely Protestant. In Wales the bulk of the population rejects Anglicanism. Religion in the so-called Celtic districts is more emotional than among the English; Wales, with Cornwall, is the seat of fervid but often evanescent "revivals." Among the English Nonconformists the Methodists have been unable to

prevent further separations. They have modified the teaching of Wesley and Whitefield, especially in the matter of instantaneous and sensible "conversion," which is, in truth, an unusual phenomenon, except in times of religious excitement. Nonconformity generally was at its height during the political ascendancy of the lower middle class, when at election times the chapels were almost converted into Liberal committee-rooms. Recently there have been signs of decline in almost all these bodies, as well as a tendency to sink their differences and unite. The Congregationists are a more intellectual sect than the Wesleyans or Baptists, and the Unitarians are a small body of highly educated people. They have largely dropped the Socinianism which separated them from the orthodox Churches; without subscribing to the ancient creeds, their ministers often preach about Christ in a way which would satisfy at least Liberal Anglicans and Dissenters. But Unitarianism both in England and America has lost ground in several districts where it was once strong. I have already spoken of the Quakers, whose history, as I have said, is very significant for any student of Protestantism.

The greatest of Free Church divines is probably James Martineau, though the academic discourses of another Unitarian, John Hamilton Thom, deserve much more attention than they have received from Anglicans. Martineau's long career as a thinker and teacher illustrates the gradual change in the centre of gravity of religion from authority to experience. Martineau never became a mystic, but in later life he definitely placed a seat of authority in the witness of the heart, not in Scripture or the Gospels. The new apologetic, he thought, must be based on "the intrinsically divine character of Christianity." Thus he has much in common with the school of Coleridge and Maurice. The Free Churches now supply a much valued contingent to Christian philosophy, learning, and Biblical criticism. Of late years the Catholicizing movement has affected some Presbyterian circles in Scotland, and a few isolated places of worship in England. The influence of Calvin seems to be everywhere on the decline.

DEVELOPMENTS OF PROTESTANTISM IN GERMANY

All through the nineteenth century Protestant Germany was seething with intellectual life. The first half of the century was the time of the great idealist philosophies, which were closely connected with theology and religion, and the creative period in philosophy was followed by Biblical criticism far more drastic and learned than had before been seen. Among philosophers, the disciples of Kant took the road of ethical rationalism, while the Hegelians tended towards speculation and mysticism. During the Romanticist movement, Hegel was the more influential of the two; and among those who were affected by him may probably be reckoned Schleiermacher, who made a great impression upon the thought of his age. Schleiermacher identified faith and a feeling of absolute dependence, and treated the Gospel as the most perfect symbol of eternal ideas. He refused to assert the future existence of the individual soul, and his teaching, though guarded in expression, really led to a mystical pantheism. But the Left wing of the Hegelians drew very different conclusions, and it became plain that this philosophy was an ambiguous auxiliary of the Christian faith. It was already partially discredited in Germany when it received a new life at the hands of English and Scottish thinkers, who founded a very vigorous school of British Hegelians, which is not yet extinct. It may, perhaps, be said of these able writers that their language is sometimes more Christian than is warranted by their metaphysical principles, though their desire to make their philosophy serve the cause of Christian apologetics is perfectly sincere. Good examples of this type are the late brothers Caird, John and Edward, and, among living thinkers, Professor Pringle Pattison.

The famous Tübingen school of Biblical criticism proceeded from the Hegelian camp. These scholars were pioneers, whose theories have not stood the test of time, though they did good work in showing on what lines New Testament criticism must be planned. The Hegelian critics of Christian origins soon provoked a vigorous

attack by Albert Ritschl, who has had a very powerful influence in Germany, though his writings have never been much read in England. Ritschl insisted, of course rightly, that Jesus Christ was not merely an illustration of Hegel's law of development, but an uniquely important historical person. Ritschl was no philosopher, and wished to emancipate Christianity entirely from metaphysics, an aim which is intelligible in a rebel against the domination of Hegel. He hoped to bring back Protestantism to its early simplicity and uncompromising Christocentrism, sweeping away not only the constructions of the idealists in his own time, but the whole of Protestant scholasticism. He had studied under Lotze, and was willing to pass as his disciple; but his real affinities are rather with Kant. He is the leader of an anti-Hellenic reaction which is apparent to-day in the Catholic Modernists and in some recent philosophies. Mysticism he abhorred, regarding it as "Catholic piety." His most distinctive contribution to religious philosophy is his sharp distinction between judgments of fact and judgments of value, a theory which, in spite of his protests, makes religious truth merely subjective, and deprives theological dogma of any basis in fact. Here again we can trace an affinity between this ultra-Protestant and the Catholic Modernists. Their pragmatism brings them near together. But their attitude towards the historical Christ is widely different; for while Ritschl even over-emphasizes the dependence of Christianity on this one historical figure, Modernism deprives Jesus of Nazareth of all the attributes of divinity, and reduces His importance as an example and as a teacher of morality. And yet we sometimes suspect that the Christological orthodoxy of Ritschl is only a "value-judgment"; in reading him we are not far from the philosophy of the "As if." The strength and weakness of Ritschlianism may be judged in his disciple Herrmann's book on *The Communion of the Christian with God,* which is fairly well known in this country. But by far the greatest of the Ritschlians (though the name cannot be given him without some qualification) is Adolf Harnack, perhaps the most learned theologian of his time, whose classic, *The History of Dogma,* is surpassed in popularity by his brilliant lectures, given almost extempore, on "What is Christianity?"

It is a significant and a rather melancholy story that

when a young German theologian was asked the other day by an Englishman what was the present position of von Harnack in Germany, the answer was: "We have conducted him to Olympus, from which he looks upon a world which knows him no more." It is an essential part of our present subject to consider why the Liberal Protestantism of Germany, which thirty years ago enjoyed a prestige commensurate with the vast learning and intellectual candour of its chief exponents, should now be so much under a cloud even in the land of its origin.

When we read Harnack's famous lectures already referred to, we find that he regards as the leading features of Jesus' message (1) the kingdom of God and its coming, (2) God the Father and the infinite value of the human soul, (3) the higher righteousness and the commandment of love. "Christianity had a founder who was himself what he taught. To steep ourselves in him is still the chief matter; but to restrict ourselves to him means to take a point of view too low for his significance. Individual religious life was what he wanted to kindle and did kindle; it is his peculiar greatness to have led men to God, so that they may thenceforth live their own life with him." The Gospels, though disfigured by miraculous stories which cannot be historical, offer us a plain picture of Christ's teaching; they tell us how His life issued in the service of His vocation; and they describe to us the impression which He made upon His disciples.

The "kingdom" is a gift from above; it is a purely religious blessing, the link with a living God; it dominates a man's whole existence, because sin is forgiven and misery banished.

The Gospel is not a positive religion; it is religion itself. It is the Fatherhood of God applied to the whole of life, a joyous certainty of the possession of eternal blessings. It is a transvaluation of all values, to which Christ first gives a calm and fearless expression.

The connection between ethics and external forms of worship is severed. Love and mercy are ends in themselves; nothing else has any value.

The three enemies of the higher life are mammon, anxiety, and selfishness. The Gospel of Christ is a Gospel of spiritual regeneration, not of social reform; but the warnings to the rich are very severe, and the call to embrace voluntary poverty would have been addressed to many

in our time. "My kingdom is not of this world"; the Gospel is above all questions of mundane development; it is concerned, not with material things, but with the souls of men.

The overwhelming impression made by Christ on His disciples is an historical fact. And yet His words were not treasured with all the care that we should have expected; the living Spirit of God is the oracle of the early Christians. (Here Harnack almost disingenuously suppresses the Pauline doctrine of mystical union with *Christ*. One of the worst defects of the Ritschlian theology is thus apparent in this independent member of his school.)

"The greatest transformation that Christianity ever underwent falls in the second century," when a great ecclesiastical and political community spreads over the Empire, in which God is honoured with a solemn ritual, in which there is a sharp difference between priest and layman, and the living faith seems to be transformed into a creed to be believed. "Greek philosophy began to effect an entrance about the year 130." (This, again, is a very strange error; the influence of Greek thought, which in Philo has transformed Judaism, is easily traced in St. Paul, in the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and in the Fourth Evangelist.) "The proposition that the Logos had appeared among men had an intoxicating effect, but it did not lead with any certainty to the God whom Jesus Christ proclaimed." "Hellenism, with all the mysteries and the philosophy of Eastern worship, elements the most sublime and the most absurd, spun into a glittering web of allegorical interpretation, now fell upon the Christian religion." The struggle with Gnosticism compelled the Church to put its teaching, worship, and discipline into fixed forms and ordinances, and to exclude all who would not yield them obedience." Henceforth the Spirit is confined within the narrowest limits; the Christian never loses his dependence on doctrine, on priest, on public worship, on the book. So originated the specifically Catholic form of godliness. Intellectualism has clung to the Christian religion ever since, and institutionalism strangles freedom. But this stifling process came gradually; the Alexandrians and Tertullian still lived by the Gospel.

Greek Catholicism made an end of polytheism, but "it takes the form, not of a Christian product in Greek dress, but of a Greek product in Christian dress." "It is a con-

tinuation of the history of Greek religion under the alien influence of Christianity"; but its fanaticism for orthodoxy is not Greek. "Its notion of redemption as a deification of mortal nature is sub-Christian, because the moral element can only be tacked to it, and because it has scarcely any connection with the Christ of the Gospel, and leads away from him." "It is the religion of the ancient world, tacked on to certain conceptions in the Gospel."

The three ingredients of Roman Catholicism, according to Harnack, are the Catholicism (in the sense defined above) which it shares with the Greek Church, the spirit of the Roman world-empire, and the Augustinian theology. These three constitute the peculiar character of the Roman Church. Legalism pervades the whole structure. The "mysteries" have become "sacraments"—binding acts and carefully limited gifts of grace. All that was Roman in the dying Western Empire took refuge within the Church. The Roman Church is the actual continuation of the Roman Empire, the influence of which may be traced in every detail. The "*Pontifex Maximus*" is Cæsar's successor. "It is an Empire that this priestly Cæsar rules, and to attack it with the argument of dogmatic polemics alone is to beat the air." Outside the corporation there is no salvation. Infallibility means simply autocratic sovereignty. It is no contradiction that under this iron rule there is room for much politic flexibility.

Roman Catholicism, then, belongs to Roman history; it has no foundation in the Gospel. It is the possession of the Latin nations, which Harnack, a German writing before the war, most erroneously supposed to have no great future. And yet it must be admitted, he adds, that this Church "still produces saints."

Protestantism, he says, "reduced" the Gospel to "its essential factors, the Word of God and Faith." Faith, for Luther, was "the confident belief in the God of grace." The Protestant Church is not an invisible community, but a community of the Spirit, the visibility of which takes different forms. "Protestantism reckons on the Gospel being something so simple, so divine, and therefore so truly human, as to be most certain of being understood when it is left entirely free, and also so as to produce essentially the same experiences and convictions in individual souls." "Our Church is not the particular Church in which we are placed, but the *societas fidei*, which has its members every-

where, even among the Greeks and Romans." Protestantism rejects the entire hierarchical system of Catholicism; it rejects all formal, external authority in religion; all ritualism, and every sort of "holy work"; all sacramentalism; the double form of morality; and the idea that some kinds of activity are more sacred than others. Religion, for the Protestant, is meant to pervade all things, and must itself be freed from whatever is external to it.

This brief summary of a remarkable book will suffice to show what Liberal Protestantism lately was in Germany. The massive learning of Harnack and others gave it great authority in England, but I do not think it ever determined the course of Liberal theology in this country. It was stamped too strongly with Lutheran ideas, for example on the nature of faith, and with the peculiar development of Lutheranism associated with the name of Ritschl. It is now a waning influence, and it will be worth while to consider how far its decline is caused by inherent defects, and how far we must admit that there has been a real reversion among us to another type of religion.

To begin with, the theory of a primitive Lutheranism overlaid by Hellenism is untrue. There never was a Christian Church in Europe unaffected by Greek thought. St. Paul himself was a "Grecian"; he was converted, as I have said before, to the Christianity of Stephen, whose heroic martyrdom he had witnessed. The Catholic Church was from the first Hellenistic. Troeltsch saw the truth much more clearly than Harnack when he said, in words which I have already quoted, that the Church was the last creative achievement of classical civilization, which may be said to have died in giving birth to it. This anti-Hellenic prejudice warps the whole theology of German Liberal Protestantism. The fusion of the Gospel with European civilization was so intimate that the two can never be torn asunder, and began so early that the Greek element in Christianity cannot be treated as an alien accretion. There was no breach of continuity when the empire became Christian.

The statement of some among the younger critics that St. Paul inaugurated the cult of the Kyrios Christos, and thereby changed Christianity into a mystery religion of a type very familiar to the Græco-Roman world, is no doubt exaggerated. The Church would make no terms with the Pagan mystery-cults, and regarded them as hostile to it-

self, if not diabolical. But even this exaggeration is nearer the truth than to suppose that the early Church revered in Jesus only the Teacher of the Fatherhood of God, and the Brotherhood of man. The doctrine of the mystical union of the Christian with the glorified and indwelling Christ was the core of St. Paul's religion, and the belief that this union is strengthened and effectuated through sacraments was already held by St. Paul, though assuredly not in a superstitious and unethical form.

Harnack's conception of faith, which is Luther's, falls far short, in penetration and spiritual depth, of the fine teaching of Clement of Alexandria and other Greek divines.

Lastly, it has been said that Ritschl has no eschatology; and this defect may be discerned in Harnack also.

The polemic of Loisy against Harnack brings out other points of difference. Loisy strikes at the heart of Liberal Protestantism. In place of a history of the Church which is mainly a record of decline and corruption, he insists on the historical necessity which made Catholicism develop as it has developed. "If you want to prove the identity of a man with a child, you do not try to force him again into his cradle." Assuming that Christ meant His Church to live and grow, it had to live and grow in a certain way, the way that it chose, or which necessity chose for it. The Christ of Liberal Protestantism, the French critic declares, is an artificial and impossible figure draped in the costume of the nineteenth century. The actual Jesus was an apocalyptic prophet, who taught His disciples to believe in a rapidly approaching end of the world, within the lifetime of most of them. This was the heart of His message; His ethical teaching was of subordinate importance, and was coloured by His erroneous belief in an approaching supernatural catastrophe. The Jesus of the Gospel and the Christ of the Church are *"comme deux Christs."* The "reduced Christianity" of Liberalism is a halfway house, with no scientific value. It is better, he argues, to recognize that the Christ of the Church's worship was created by the faith and love of the early Christians. A creed is not a flat historical recital, but a poetical and symbolic representation of what faith finds in the objects of its contemplation.

Thus Loisy's Modernism separates truths of fact from truths of faith. Its negative historical criticism is far more

drastic than that of the majority of Liberals; but by means of a philosophy akin to pragmatism it restores with one hand all that it has taken away with the other. Where the Liberal speaks of "traditionalism" as the enemy, the Modernist speaks of "intellectualism." Faith, as we have found some of the younger members of the school declaring, is fundamentally "irrational."

There can be no doubt that the present century has witnessed a widespread revolt against the domination of natural science, with its tendency to a mechanical interpretation of all existence. Several influences from diverse sides have converged to produce this result. There has been a great recrudescence of superstition, a tendency to believe in miracles, and to adopt a philosophy which will justify both credulity and scepticism. There has also been an increase of herd-contagion, which prompts people to talk of "the revival of the corporate idea," and to disparage what they call individualism. This movement has been accentuated by the disasters of the last fourteen years. All these concurrent influences have tended to depress Protestantism, and to encourage a rather superficial but sometimes enthusiastic Neo-Catholicism. Every defeat of civilization, every set-back to science, is a victory for Roman Catholicism, which is fundamentally hostile to modern ideas. The rejection of "intellectualism" is especially welcome to the half-educated, who in democratic countries set the tone to society generally. It is for the half-educated that newspapers, authors, politicians, and Churchmen alike must cater. The "intellectuals" must beware, for they are very few.

Whether the intellectual and moral frivolity of the last ten years will continue it is difficult to say, and prophecy, whether optimistic or the reverse, is no part of the plan of this little book. My object in summarizing the historical developments of Protestantism has been to help us to disengage the accidental and temporary from the essential and permanent elements in Protestantism. I shall not attempt to predict its future, which must depend on the condition of European and American civilization. There is no reason whatever to suppose that the more rational, moral, and spiritual type of religion will prevail over the more superstitious, unethical, and materialistic, unless civilization generally is progressing towards a higher type. A decadent race will have a decadent religion; and Cathol-

icism, which has already provided a euthanasia for one moribund civilization, may easily perform the same office for another. My sole object in the concluding section which follows will be to determine in broad outlines what the Protestant type of Christianity is, when cleared of the extraneous elements which have modified its action in the existing Protestant Churches.

THE SEAT OF AUTHORITY

When Sabatier contrasted Protestantism, as the religion of the Spirit, with Catholicism as the chief religion of authority, he was accused by Catholics of opposing two things which are by no means incompatible with each other. If the characteristic of a saint is to be spiritually minded, can any other form of Christianity, it has been asked, show so noble and beautiful an array of saints as the Catholic Church? Would it not even be possible to argue that a certain lack of spirituality has characterized the virtues of Protestantism? The objection shows, perhaps, that the antithesis has not been correctly stated. The question is not so much whether reliance on authority is compatible with spirituality as whether the attitude of Catholics towards an authority external to the individual is not a negation of the freedom which in St. Paul, for example, belongs to the spiritual man, who judges all things and is judged by no man. We have seen that there are four possible courts of appeal—the institutional Church, speaking either through tradition or through the mouths of its constituted rulers; the Holy Scriptures; the inner light, regarded as the illumination of the mind by the Spirit of God; and human reason, which includes both philosophy and the verdicts of science and criticism. No body of Christians rests exclusively on any one of the four, or entirely excludes any one of the four. But whereas the Catholic regards the voice of the Church as infallible, and not to be questioned without disloyalty, and while the Protestantism of the Reformation period gives much the same absoluteness to the revelation of God's will in the inspired Word, the spirit of Protestantism, when it understands itself, holds that there is no infallible authority anywhere,

but that men are educated both by what Dean Church called the gifts of civilization, and by the Holy Spirit, whose operations are now often called religious experience. Modern Protestantism gives decidedly greater authority to the internal witnesses, the mystical experience and reason, than to either of the two external guides. In so doing it believes that it is true to the original Gospel. Now here we have a cleavage between Catholicism and Protestantism which can never be bridged over. Mr. Fawkes quotes two passages which illustrate the contrast. Mark Pattison says: "Those rites and doctrines which have made most noise in the Romanist controversy are those which are the least of the essence of Romanism. The Virgin and the Saints, Reliques, Images, Purgatory, and Masses—these bywords with the vulgar and the unthinking are powerless decorations or natural developments." (The inclusion of the Mass in this list is certainly a mistake. I have shown in the course of this sketch how supremely important the Sacraments are in the Catholic scheme.) "The one essential principle of the Catholic system is the control of the individual conscience by an authority or law placed without it and exercised over it by men assuming to act in the name of Heaven." On the page before Mr. Fawkes quotes a passage from Bishop Gore, which proves not only how congenial the idea of submission and obedience is to the natural Catholic, but how ready a Catholic is to read this kind of authority into the New Testament, where it is to be found only in that very typical ecclesiastic, the High Priest Caiaphas. "The New Testament presents us with a picture, which later Church history only elaborates, of a corporate body legislating for its members with a divine sanction. The normal Christian is a man under authority —the authority of the body he belongs to. In his whole life he ought to feel this corporate authority, and he ought to recognize in detail the precepts of the Church." To which the typical Protestant will reply indignantly that this is precisely the way in which a powerful institutional Church always "quenches the Spirit," "despises prophesyings," and strangles every attempt to put new life into dry bones.

There is, however, one qualification which must be made before we identify Protestantism with complete freedom from authority. Protestantism stands or falls by the historical revelation made nearly two thousand years ago in

the person and the work of the Redeemer. It is bound up with certain historical events as closely as orthodox Romanism, and much more closely than Catholic Modernism. The Protestant is often twitted with inconsistency on this very ground, and there have been some Protestants who envy the Modernists their independence of a historical record, which, like all other historical records, may possibly be untrustworthy in parts. To rest the truth of religion on certain historical occurrences may seem contrary to the whole attitude of Protestantism, and may be suspected of being a mere survival from "the religions of authority." So far as I can see, this objection is valid against some developments of Protestantism, but not against the Christology of St. Paul. We cannot cut the link between the indwelling "Spirit of Christ" and the historical Jesus of Nazareth without altering the type of our religion. It must be said plainly that the Protestant chooses not to be invulnerable on this side. In the Person of Christ he recognizes an absolute Authority, though that Authority is not a dead hand, but a quickening Spirit. *Conversio fit ad Dominum ut Spiritum.*

INSTITUTIONALISM

Together with the revival of interest in mysticism, based on a new and fruitful scientific study of the psychology of religious belief, there has been, ever since the Romanticist movement, a tendency to emphasize what is called the corporate idea, the idea of loyalty to the institutional Church. This has been represented as the religious form of Socialism, though in truth it has more in common with Syndicalism. Aubrey Moore, one of the ablest of the *Lux Mundi* school, writing in 1889, saw in it an abandonment of the "individualism" of the industrial revolution, and of the "atomistic" natural philosophy which accompanied it. Those who had been brought up in these traditions were, he says exultingly, bewildered by the sight of "men in the nineteenth century actually expressing a belief in a divine society and a supernatural presence in our midst, a brotherhood in which men become members of an organic whole by sharing in a common life, a service of man which

is the natural and spontaneous outcome of the service of God." Other writers, studying the history of religions in a more detached manner, have come to the conclusion that religion is essentially a social, not a private affair, and that, as Troeltsch says, "the essence of religion is not dogma and idea, but cultus and communion, an intercourse of the entire community." Royce in his last important work emphasized the same view, finding the centre of Christianity in "loyalty to the beloved community." "Such a community is an indispensable means of salvation for the individual man, and is the fitting realm wherein alone the kingdom of heaven which the Master preached can find its expression." Such words would be rigorous in the mouth of an Ultramontane; they are much more astonishing and significant as coming from a non-Catholic, who refuses to identify the ideal community with any existing Church. All these writers, and many others who might be cited, seem to agree with Cyprian that to be a Christian means to be an enthusiastic Churchman. This is a view which no Protestant can accept.

On the other side, we have Swinburne declaring that he could accept the Crucified if He came without His "leprous bride," the Church. And when we consider the record of the Great Church in history, our condemnation of the much-lauded "corporate idea" in action is likely to be very severe. The great crime of Catholicism has been its claim to a monopoly of divine grace, a claim fundamentally unchristian, and in practice a justification of such fraud and callous cruelty as no other political organization has ever been guilty of. Catholicism has attempted to win the masses by pandering to the grossest superstitions, and by the most materialistic promises and threats. Even Cardinal Newman admits that "a popular religion is always a corrupt religion"; and George Tyrrell, in reply to the plea that Catholicism appeals to the multitude, says: "Could not the same be said of some of the worst religions of the world? Are not these mediocre millions the easy and natural prey of a priestly caste, with its usual promises of cheap salvation by unspiritual external methods? It is not in having the poor with it, but in doing them good, that a religion is proved to be Christ's. What if it keep them poor, or make them poorer, or foster their ignorance and moral degradation? The real question is, What does Catholicism do for the moral and spiritual eleva-

tion of the degraded? It is not enough to get them to go through a routine of religious duties if there be no moral redemption." It is no wonder that the author of these embarrassing questions was adjudged to be a bad Catholic, and condemned to be buried like a dog. The well-disciplined Roman Catholic Churchman allows no such scruples to cramp his style. *Melius est ut unus pereat quam unitas.* Let the innocent Dreyfus die in prison; let the Irishman who has committed a treacherous murder be told to leave "politics" out of his confession; let the lucrative imposture of Lourdes be encouraged by the Curia itself; let the Greek Orthodox Church be handed over without protest to wholesale spoliation and massacre by Turks and Bolsheviks. The logic of institutionalism is inexorable. Given the Roman monopolist claim, and all these things will be done, and not inconsistently.

To the Protestant the question is quite plainly between Christ, who said, "My kingdom is not of this world," and the Machiavellian ethics of Roman imperialism. The tree is known by its fruits, and the fruits of Catholic institutionalism are proved to be poisonous. A Church which has no other "interests" except the highest welfare of the people who worship, or even who refuse to worship, in its temples will not be able to make concordats with Governments; it will form no "Centre party" to make bargains with politicians and extort concessions from them; it will organize no ingenious apparatus for extracting money from the faithful; it will encourage rather than obstruct secular education, and will not try to turn little children into finished bigots. By numerical and democratic standards it will be a failure and a mark for derision. But it will be like the leaven which is hid in three measures of meal, till the whole is leavened.

SECULARITY AND OTHER-WORLDLINESS

HERE the record of Protestantism has been ambiguous. Catholicism, by turning spiritual hopes and fears into very concrete and vivid pictures of enjoyment and torture, managed, by means of these irreligious appeals, to exercise some influence upon the irreligious majority. Protestantism

has, unhappily, not been behindhand in following the same tactics. Nemesis has now fallen upon both branches of Christendom alike in the general incredulity about human immorality in any sense. The Churches have so vulgarized and misused "the blessed hope of everlasting life" that they have nearly killed it. Secularity, provoked by these illegitimate bribes and menaces, is the great enemy which threatens Christianity in all its branches.

Socialism is the modern form of Millenarianism, and sometimes enlists in its service a quasi-religious enthusiasm. There are striking resemblances between the Bolsheviks and the Jesuits. But there is a real problem as to what should be the attitude of the Church of Christ towards social reform. It is a modern problem, which hardly agitated the medieval Church, and in the Reformation period came to the front chiefly among the sectaries.

The policy of Rome is to condemn Communism, which is radically anti-religious and, a Catholic would say, contrary to the Law of Nature, but to show sympathy with Labour movements, if the Church can get anything out of them. Catholicism dislikes the middle class, which in religion is democratic and independent. Protestants are as much divided on political questions as any other large body of citizens drawn from all classes. There is a decided tendency, both in the Anglican Church and in the Free Churches, to secularize the Christian message, and to repudiate St. Paul's saying that "if in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable." It is sometimes alleged that Anglicanism is the religion of the "respectable" classes, and therefore prone to Conservatism; the Anglo-Catholic party is eager to prove that this charge is no longer true. There is a good deal of competition for court chaplaincies to King Demos. This conversion of the clergy to Socialism would have been more impressive if it had come before universal suffrage. The real danger is of secularity, taking refuge in politicism. A Church which has gone into politics, on either side, is thenceforth good for nothing but to be cast out and trodden underfoot of men.

The ironies of history are colossal, and support von Eicken's contention that all institutions tend to develop into their opposites. The Catholic Church, which in the name of the Master offered a patient, heroic, and purely passive resistance to the persecuting secular power, issued in the ar-

rogant pretensions of a Hildebrand. Puritanism, which with equal sincerity preached the sinfulness of all self-indulgent expenditure, ended in producing the magnates of the great American Trusts. Rightly considered, these two examples show how ready the devil is to capture the organizations formed to defeat him. When he has succeeded, he never changes the labels.

PROTESTANTISM AND SCIENCE

In spite of the reaction against mechanistic materialism which has been apparent in our generation, in spite also of the profound doubts and fundamental difficulties which are beginning to agitate the calm waters of scientific research, there is not the slightest sign of that "bankruptcy of science" of which the Neo-Catholic Brunetière spoke too confidently. Within the ranks of scientific investigators there is no loss of faith, but an abounding confidence and enthusiasm. In an age of disillusionment and cynicism, when many are saying "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die," the atmosphere which plays about nature-study, thin but bracing like the air of mountain-tops, remains clear, sunny, and health-giving. Nor must we give much importance to such absurd outbreaks of belated obscurantism as that of the American "Fundamentalists," which illustrate only the extreme barbarism of some strata of society in the United States. Such coteries have always existed; they are now vocal; they were formerly silent. But the spread of education, and still more the acquaintance with machinery which is now becoming general, are steadily implanting in the popular mind the scientific way of looking at the world, and eradicating the last traces of that supernatural dualism which was and is the philosophy of Catholicism. Science is the purgatory of religion, and of politics. Recrudescences of spiritualism, faith-healing, necromancy, and other superstitions show undoubtedly that the craving for miracle dies hard. "Miracle," said a German thinker, "is the dearest child of faith." But the current still flows steadily towards the scientific view of the world-order. Even Catholicism is more chary of calling attention to its most cherished miracles, except in dealing with minds which desire them.

That such exist is shown by a letter received a few days ago from a recent "convert." "What other Church," she asked me, "can show such miracles as the liquefying blood of St. Januarius, the healings at Lourdes, and the flying house at Loreto?"

Now Protestantism, when once free from Bibliolatry, can come to terms with modern science in a way impossible to Romanism. An entente between these two old enemies would necessitate some bold changes both in creed and conduct; but these changes would leave the vital part of Protestantism untouched. The Roman Church has declared that there can be no reconciliation between Rome and modern Liberalism or Progress; Protestantism is entirely free from this uncompromising preference for the Dark Ages. It is in this direction that Protestants may look for the beginning of what may really be a new Reformation, a resumption of the unfinished work of Sir Thomas More, Giordano Bruno, and Erasmus.

PROSE AND POETRY

Protestantism is very inferior to Catholicism in its knowledge of human nature. The typical Protestant, if he is religious at all, communes alone with God in a Holy of Holies from which all that is frivolous, light, and merely pretty is excluded. "A man's religion," says Hocking, "is the hiddenest thing in him." Or, with Whitehead, "a man's religion is the way he spends his solitude." The Catholic is halfway to the Hindoo, who, it has been said, eats, drinks, washes, and *sins* religiously and sociably. Religion is not always a very serious or moral affair; indeed, some religions are thoroughly bad things. But the Protestant, in his preoccupation with ethics, undervalues the æsthetic side of life, and thereby loses the sympathy of most persons who have the artistic temperament. Poetry plays a much larger part in life than the Protestant is willing to admit. For him a myth must be a hard fact or a wicked lie: sacramental symbolism is fraudulent magic; all the petty world of half-belief which the Catholic imagination spreads between the self and hard reality must be swept away ruthlessly. And not being very clear-headed, the typical Protestant after all keeps something which belongs

to the discredited class of opinions. This is really a difficult problem. Concessions are dangerous, as we have seen in the Anglican Church; and yet it is a pity to alienate a large number of men, and a much larger number of women, because we distrust the expression of religious emotion by appeals to the eye. There is nothing necessarily degrading in such symbolism. God speaks to the soul without language and without form. The language and the form are ours, but we have a right to be intelligible to ourselves, and we need not be afraid of warmth and colour.

PROTESTANTISM STILL IN THE MAKING

SANTAYANA, in his brilliant volume, *Reason in Religion*, has a satirical account of the Protestant Churches, the defects of which are sure to be apparent to a thinker of Spanish origin. He hits the mark when he says that the nations of Northern Europe are still intellectually and spiritually immature as compared with the Latin races, who have had a much longer experience. The northern barbarians accepted from their civilized neighbours the Mediterranean religion in its Christian form, though it was far from really suiting them. Catholicism, says Santayana, was "the last sigh of two dying civilizations"; it was "post-rational," world-renouncing, and ascetic. The Northern Europeans, on the contrary, were adventurous, chivalrous, aggressive, and confident of the future; thoughtful and moral, but childlike in their inexperience of civilized life. They never understood either the original Gospel or the old religions of the Roman Empire which helped to make that curious amalgam, the Catholic Church. They transformed what they took, introducing, for example, the code of chivalry into Christianity, and were unconscious of that large portion of the Catholic tradition which was unintelligible to them. Without subscribing to this view of Catholicism as a creed of resignation and apathy, which seems to me only half true, I think Santayana is right in saying that Protestantism has not yet fully found itself. In the forms which it has taken hitherto it is scarcely worthy of the vigorous nations in which it has been the dominant faith. There has been a confusion in the spiritual life of the Western peoples, a want of

clarity in estimating the values of life, a lack of disciplined thought which has often made the struggles of Protestantism against Catholicism like the tactics and strategy of untrained troops. There is also, at least in England and the United States, a downright silliness in many of the religious fads and crazes which find adherents, to which there is no parallel in Southern Europe. To erect Anglo-Israelitism, prohibition of alcohol, and prohibition of tobacco ("Worship the Lord with clean lips!") into religious dogmas shows a very crude mentality.

Nevertheless, these are the vagaries of a young and half-formed civilization rather than symptoms of senile decay. I have renounced any intention of predicting what forms Protestant Christianity will take in the future. Three things only may be asserted with some confidence. Firstly, the Christianity of Northern Europe and North America has still a long and vigorous career before it; it will certainly recover from its present depression. Secondly, it must undergo great changes; there can be no return to Luther and Calvin. And, thirdly, it will not end by subjecting itself again to Latin Christianity, which is even more antipathetic to its deepest instincts than when it threw off the yoke of Rome four hundred years ago.

BOOK TO BE RETURNED

284.09
I45

Inge, William Ralph
AUTHOR

Protestantism.
TITLE

29106

Date Due	Borrower's Name

284.09
I45 Inge, William Ralph
Protestantism.

29106